



A

SHORT PROTESTANT COMMENTARY

ON THE BOOKS OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

VOL. I.



A

# SHORT PROTESTANT COMMENTARY

ON THE BOOKS OF THE

## NEW TESTAMENT:

WITH GENERAL AND SPECIAL INTRODUCTIONS.

---

EDITED BY

PROF. PAUL WILHELM SCHMIDT

AND

PROF. FRANZ VON HOLZENDORFF

---

Translated from the Third Edition of the German

BY

FRANCIS HENRY JONES, B.A.

VOL. I.



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,  
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;  
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

---

1882.

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,  
178, STRAND.

## NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

---

THE Commentary, of which a translation is here given to English readers, is a Commentary on Luther's version of the New Testament, such corrections as the commentators thought necessary being made in the notes. It may be presumed that the very same arguments which led the editors to take Luther's version as their basis,\* would have led them in England to take the "Authorized Version." Accordingly, the words of the New Testament as given in italics in the notes and then commented upon, are taken throughout from the Authorized Version. The rendering there given in inverted commas is that of the German commentator, and where introduced by the words "should be" is given by him as a necessary correction, some error occurring in Luther's version as in our own. Where the quotation is simply followed by a correction in inverted commas without remark, the correction is the reading found in Luther's version, and accepted by the commentator without remark. With the exception of the correction of errors which are found in Luther's version only, and not in our own, I have reproduced even those notes which may appear unnecessary in consequence of the passages to which they refer being already more lucid in the English version than in the German, or trifling in consequence of the English version being already much nearer

\* See p. xx. It has not been thought necessary to repeat what is said on this point in the General Introduction. It can have no interest except for German readers. The remarks here referred to may for the most part be applied to the Authorized Version and the various English Versions from private hands.

to the original than the German. I have thought it better to retain a few sentences that are unnecessary to the English reader, than to risk the omission of anything that he might find useful. It will perhaps be an advantage rather than a disadvantage to English readers that the authors of this Commentary, in some parts at least, have passed somewhat lightly over questions of textual criticism or translation. A German writer could scarcely deal with these questions just as our version requires them to be dealt with. I have added a very few notes in square brackets [ ], which seemed to me to be required on this account; but must recommend those who are interested in this branch of Scriptural investigation to use some critical edition of the Authorized Version—for example, the Variorum New Testament of Rev. R. L. Clarke and Alfred Goodwin.

F. H. J.

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
Preface to the First Edition, by Prof. von Holzendorff . . . . .	ix
Preface to the Third Edition . . . . .	xiii
Introduction, by Prof. Paul Wilhelm Schmidt . . . . .	1
The Synoptic Gospels, by Prof. Holtzmann . . . . .	33
Commentary on Matthew , . . . . .	51
Commentary on Mark , . . . . .	127
Commentary on Luke , . . . . .	153
Introduction to the Fourth Gospel, by Dr. Späth . . . . .	193
Commentary on John , . . . . .	209
Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles, by Pastor Ziegler . .	256
Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles , . . . . .	270



## P R E F A C E.

---

To the people of Germany the Bible is not what the Reformers intended that it should be. The relation of the present generation to it oscillates between an idolatrous worship of the letter on the one hand, and contemptuous rejection on the other hand.

In the days of Luther, our ancestors read the Bible with a view to justification of the Protestant position and edification in it, with a view, that is, to a *Protest* against mediæval tradition and sacerdotalism.

Now all this is changed. In the hands of a clergy at enmity with science, the Bible has been made false to its own nature; and, like the Popes in the middle ages, dogmas, canons and orthodox traditions, are to-day set over the Bible itself as infallible. This seems to us an un-Protestant course. The Bible is an unfailing source of Christian faith throughout the history of man; but is it therefore itself to be simply the *object* of our faith? Not only the contents and authenticity, but also the origin of its separate parts, and the purposes which the writers had in view, must be subject to the most comprehensive and searching scientific inquiry.

For a long time the majority of Protestant readers took the Bible, without consideration, as a *single* divine utterance, delivered as it were in one unbroken discourse. They did not know that the separate parts of the New Testament were produced by different men in very different circumstances, and having to some extent diverse ideas, gifts, knowledge and conceptions. They did not perceive that the writers of the various parts of the New Testament have described the earliest events of Chris-

tian history, not *in conjunction* with one another, but partly *side by side*, partly *in succession*, and very frequently *in opposition* to one another.

At the same time, it is only those who treat the New Testament unhistorically that can speak of its unreconciled contradictions, those who regard it as an external unit, instead of connected stages of an historical development of early Christian views. Can we speak of one century as a *contradiction* of the century which preceded it? Is the peculiar characteristic of one person a contradiction of the character of any other man? Have not the same sun and the same moon been sung by hundreds of poets in different languages and varied metres? The reflection, the echo, of the divine nature in the human soul is more varied than the voice of poetry before the brilliant lights of day and night. Such contradictions as we acknowledge do exist in the Bible are no more than ripples upon the surface of an ocean the depths of which are unmoved.

The honest theology which investigates without reserve, and does not trouble itself about the interests of ecclesiastical institutions and authorities, has long ago won an historical view of the Bible, which differs completely from the idea of those who still believe that all that is necessary for a proper understanding of the Bible is to be able to read. Reverence for the Bible flourishes, not in the mystic darkness of the supernatural, but in the light of history. Historical experience teaches us that the eye-witnesses of a fact are the best narrators, but are not the best judges of its nature. The historian is almost always a better judge than the contemporary of an event. And this is true even in regard to the apostles. Their immediate perception did not contain that fulness of knowledge which science has constructed by centuries of labour. But along with this riper knowledge of the science of our day, scholars have hitherto felt no corresponding necessity of imparting it to the people, nor have they had the courage to subject popular Christianity to the test of a maturer consideration of the Bible.

Our *Protestant Commentary* is the result of a conviction that even educated persons, or those who regard themselves as such, are in pressing need of guidance along the way which leads to a proper understanding of the Bible, and that it is the duty of the science of to-day to bring the history of primitive Christian times within easier reach of the popular intellect. *Protestant Faith* has abolished the gulf between clergy and laity. *Protestant Science* must see that the immature ideas which sprang from the dreary orthodoxy of former centuries no longer run rank side by side with an esoteric Biblical learning confined to our universities and colleges.

A full acquaintance with the Biblical documents, and first of all with those of the New Testament, a confident approach of learned theology to the requirements of popular religious and moral education, to test the Bible by the standards of *historical proof*,—these appear to us to be vital matters affecting that German Protestantism before which the alternative is placed, at the present day, of either dying out or renewing its youth. Only as an ever-advancing development of Christian truth, only by perpetually breaking with all tests of human authority in matters of belief, and only by the most distinct rejection of that darkness of ecclesiastical infallibility which has its roots in the compulsion of creeds, can Protestantism maintain its position as a guiding power among the German people.

Science respects the doubt which, under the name of unbelief, is straightway condemned to perdition by zealots. For the faith which is afraid of scientific tests, or despises human reason in matters of religion, loses its moral value. The editors of this *Commentary* confess their faith that an end must be put to the contest between reason and faith, between religion and science, if the life of our people is to flourish.

In the preparation of this *Commentary* we have confined ourselves to the New Testament, reserving anything further for the future. Our plan is to take as our starting-point the honoured language of Luther's version, familiar in the churches and schools,

the homes and hearts, of the German people; to correct it where necessary; to elucidate it by explanatory notes and references; and finally, by means of a short introduction to the New Testament as a whole, and separate introductions to its different parts, to show the historical position of the Biblical documents.

Formerly the letter of the Bible prevailed. To-day we seek its indwelling spirit. The great advances which have been made during the last three centuries in philology and history enable us to solve those doubts which former generations attempted simply to suppress by the despotic commands of creeds.

Our object is not to contribute anything new to Biblical science. We avoid as far as is practicable the region of doubtful surmises, and only seek to present those results to which definite shape has been given by the conscientious investigations of the soundest scholars.

Our work will not escape misunderstanding and disapproval. We know that we have to count upon the opposition of ancient prejudices and deep-rooted indifference, and even upon the opposition of many who rest in the certainty of pure faith. We do not boast of perfection, but at the same time it is not necessary for us to defend ourselves. We await the final sentence as to the value of our work from those who are engaged with us in striving after the emancipating power of truth which overcomes error, and after peace in those Christian communities which rest upon the universal priesthood.

FRANZ VON HOLZENDORFF.

CHARLOTTENBURG, SEPT. 25TH, 1872.

## PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

---

How should the Bible be read with this Commentary? As Goethe has remarked incidentally in his Aphorisms that it ought to be read: "I am convinced that the beauty of the Bible increases in proportion as it is understood; that is to say, in proportion as we consider and perceive that each word which we take *generally* *has had a peculiar, special and directly individual application in accordance with given circumstances of time and place.*"

Goethe, then, read the Bible. And he recommends those to do likewise who purpose to comprehend and to experience the beautiful as he understood it. But it is all in vain. Zealous readers of Goethe are seldom zealous readers of the Bible. Is there then "a great gulf fixed" between our culture and our Bible? Assuredly there is if the Bible is to be a *barrier* or a *statute-book* to human thought. But it is plain that what the poet meant was that, instead of this, it is an excellent *source* for the refreshment and enrichment of the spirit—a source from which we may derive an unperverted view of the most important creative religious epochs, and also valuable impulses to the life of our own deepest consciousness. It is plain that he meant that the heroic religious characters and the fundamental religious ideas of the Bible (*provided they be considered and understood purely historically*—as they really were, and not as the Church afterwards depicted or caricatured them) are well adapted to teach and edify the man of modern times, even though his intellectual idea of the world, and even to some extent his fundamental conception of life, may be separated by a wide gulf from

those of special Biblical pictures and ideas. It is only in the same way that we can explain another passage from Goethe's Aphorisms: "There is and will be much discussion as to the advantage or disadvantage of the popular dissemination of the Bible. To me it is clear that it will be mischievous, as it has always been, if used dogmatically or capriciously; beneficial, as it has always been, if accepted didactically (for our instruction) and with feeling." In other words, the Bible will be beneficial if it be read in the spirit of Protestantism.

With a clear conscience we delight to adhere in the third edition of this Commentary to the name of Protestant, on which so much abuse has been lavished, and the meaning of which, nevertheless, its opponents, especially, so well understand.

We read the Bible as Protestants. That is to say, first of all, not in the spirit of the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome (in the fourth session of the Council of Trent) declares to its adherents: "For the restraint of wanton minds the synod decrees that no man relying upon his own wisdom in matters of faith and morals, pertaining to the construction of Christian doctrine, perverting the sacred Scripture to his own sense, may venture to interpret it contrarily to that sense which has been held and is held by holy Mother Church, whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the sacred Scriptures," &c.—The spirit of the Reformation was quite different. Following the contemporary tendency of classical learning to go back in everything to the earliest sources, it broke down, with the power of a young religious life, the barriers which were intended to separate the inquiring Christian from the oldest and most genuine testimony of the Christian spirit. Those who were weary of the vain feasts of Rome, and were looking for wholesome nourishment to satisfy the pious longings of their hearts, were invited by it to the closest acquaintance with the treasures of the scriptural word that they might take therefrom the bread of life freely. "Were the holy Scripture a tree," said Luther exhorting them, "and all its words branches and twigs, I have shaken every branch and

spray that I might know what it contained and what it was capable of, and each time I have shaken down a little fruit." Assuredly the latest "catholic" movement against the sacrilegious pretensions of Rome could only have attained a higher significance than that of a semi-ecclesiastical, semi-political episode, by passing beyond the "old" catholicism of Trent, the middle ages and the fathers, to the oldest catholicism of the simple primitive religion of Jesus, which we find in the Bible, with its sparkling waters, and not to the "hewn cisterns" of any fixed doctrinal tradition, "broken cisterns that can hold no water." If the portrait of Luther at Worms, with the book in his right hand, does not speak plainly enough, the smoke that rose Anno Domini 1877 from the pile of Italian Bibles solemnly burnt before the cathedral of Spezzia in celebration of the Pope's jubilee, should show even the dimmest eyes what it is that Rome fears, and what weapon is shattering her dazzling shield.

We read the Bible as Protestants. That is to say, in the second place, not with the eyes of "evangelicalism." To a great extent the ordinary evangelical religious instruction, with its manuals and catechismal expositions, has rendered whole sections of the German people incapable of *reading* the Bible; i.e. of reading it without bias, and allowing to the different Biblical writers their own meaning. If they read in the fourth Gospel, "I and the Father are one," they think that the Bible, like the Church, teaches the equality of Jesus with God. If, together with Father and Son, the Holy Spirit be mentioned, they think they have before them sufficient scriptural ground for the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity. If Jesus asks, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" they imagine that the Jesus "of the Bible" maintains that he possesses absolute moral perfection as the inheritance of his divine nature, while this same Jesus elsewhere emphatically disclaims this perfection and ascribes it to God alone. Again, when Jesus says his kingdom is not *of* this world, they forget that it is nevertheless *for* this world, that it is to *come*, that its members "inherit the earth;" and they suppose that the Bible demands exclusive devotion to the world beyond

the grave—as though the Christianity of the Bible were not the very religion which endeavours to make every religious power, every impulse arising from communion of the soul with God, directly productive of moral results. Or, again, if the Bible speaks of the general sinfulness of human nature, they credit it, consciously or unconsciously, with Augustine's doctrine of original sin as constituting the very *essence* of human nature. Even Anselm's mediæval doctrine of the insulted honour of God, and the necessary atonement by the satisfying sacrifice of the god-man, secretly floats before their minds wherever they read of justification by faith and reconciliation with God. Finally, when they have collected together all these doctrines, and some others in addition, they imagine they have before them the Christianity of the Bible, and many of them then declare that it is superseded—before they really know what it is.

“The Christianity of the Bible!” As if the Bible was *one* book, in which we might look for a uniform system of doctrine, complete in itself, concerning all things human and divine.

We read the Bible as Protestants. That is to say, in the third place, *not superstitiously*. The Bible has not come to Christendom as the complete gift of the revelation of God. The oldest name for it is “Biblia,” that is, “scriptures” or “writings,” the very name indicating a plurality of books, which have been gradually brought together to form our “holy Scripture,” a collection of the documents of two different religions. We must never forget this: not only that Abraham and Moses knew nothing of our Old Testament, that even David knew only its very first rudiments, and that the Old Testament itself was only completed with the fall of the nation of Israel; but also that for the whole of the first century of the *Christian* era there were only a few separate writings of the New Testament which were known, and these as private documents, and that it was not till the third, fourth and fifth centuries that our “New Testament” was finally closed as an established collection of the sacred writings of Christendom, or at any rate received general recognition as such in the Church.—But just as the *collection* of the “Biblia”

has its origin, not in any supernatural arrangements, but in a natural historical development, so also have the separate writings both of the Old Testament and of the New, with which latter alone we are at present concerned. As to the manner in which a “Gospel” arose, the author of the Gospel according to Luke, for instance, gives us the clearest information when he says: “After many have taken in hand to write down a narrative of those things which have happened among us—even as those who from the first were eye-witnesses or ministers of the word delivered them unto us—I also have thought well, having ascertained it all from the beginning, to write it all for thee, Theophilus, with care and in order, that thou mightest have a sure ground for the doctrine in which thou hast been instructed” (Luke i. 1—4). Thus simple and natural was the course of the New Testament historical writing. And if in the fourth Gospel *not* historical but didactic considerations determine the representation given of the person and life of Jesus, the peculiar personal bias of the writer is most candidly and simply acknowledged at the close of the book. How the “Epistles” and the “Revelation” have been determined down to their very sentences and particular words by definite personal interests, or the interests of specific communities, by special purposes of dispute or reconciliation, of correction and chastisement or comfort and encouragement, while the occasions which gave rise to them have always been purely historical, purely human,—all this is shown both generally and in detail in the historical introductions contained in these volumes. That the divine spirit inspired heart and soul of the New Testament writers, who can deny, that has perceived the slightest breath of the spirit of primitive Christianity, or has himself understood that all of us are what we are by the grace of God? But that the Bible is therefore “God’s word,” as though God had himself dictated the Bible and only left to the sacred writers to commit the eternal truth to writing, is an idea unworthy alike of the divine and of the human spirit. The first beginnings of such an idea in the era of the Reformation may be explained by the inner struggles which convulsed Christendom

at that time, and may be pardoned ; but its supposed justification finds not the slightest support in the Bible itself (comp. pp. 26 sq.).

As soon as Biblical research had entirely freed itself from such views as these, the uniformity of a supposed supernatural literature which had formerly met its gaze was suddenly transformed into varied and living pictures of primitive Christian characters and ideas, disputes and reconciliations. It had become a fruitful historical science ; a science, in the strictest sense, like that of the interpretation and history of ancient classical literature, following the same laws of linguistic and historical investigation, only its subject gave to it a higher consecration and a more universal human importance.

One thing more in conclusion. We read the Bible as Protestants ; that is to say, under the guidance of modern science, and for that very reason *not modernizing it*. The sway of so-called rationalism is not yet extinct, nor with it the race of those readers of the Bible who, in order to escape the conflict between the Bible and their own religious convictions, violently transform the original ideas of the Biblical writers into the ideas of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These violators of the word of the Bible still stood to some extent under the curse of a superstitious devotion to the Bible, and for that reason endeavoured to shelter *their own* conception of nature and miracle, of human reason and the divine spirit, under the authority of scriptural proof. But what should we say to the expositor of the Homeric poems who should undertake to "explain" the poetic expressions of the naive old Grecian views of the universe and life in accordance with the prevailing ideas of the present day ? The men of the New Testament, no less, pictured to themselves a different earth, a different heaven, from ours. The Protestant reader leaves these to them, while he looks at their spiritual life reverently and *independently*. It is enough, if the same impulse urges us to the same almighty, all-wise, all-loving Spirit to which their heart and intellect made its offering ; then we have, after all, the same religion as they. The Christians of the New Testament regarded the peculiar sanctifying and beatific nature of

Jesus with other eyes than we. It is enough, if we tread with the same zeal the paths of the highest religion which he disclosed; then we have, after all, the same Christianity as they. The *highest* religion, we say; for higher than the doctrine of the religious *unity* of man with God no other religion can aspire, and this is the peculiar doctrine of Christianity

Thus, then, we read the Bible as Protestants. One or two further remarks we must make as to details.

(1) For the furtherance of a correct historical consideration of the New Testament, it would of course be a decided advantage if the collection of New Testament writings actually began with the biography of one who is undoubtedly the earliest Christian writer, viz. the Apostle Paul, and his separate Epistles were then arranged in their proper places in chronological order. Then the later books should follow, including the Gospels, as we have set forth in our Introduction (pp. 9—20). The editors of this Commentary, however, did not consider that the time had yet come for an arrangement at present so strange to readers of the Bible. For the present, therefore, we adhere to the traditional arrangement according to the *contents* of the separate books, viz. history, doctrine and prophecy.

(2) We have not based our Commentary on the text known as the “Revised Text” of the Bible depository of Halle. Though otherwise well intended and industriously executed, too great a reverence for the old version has prevented it from attaining to a thorough correction of all that is actually erroneous or unintelligible. The available translations undertaken by private individuals, that of Prof. V. Weizsäcker included, are more valuable for their learning and accuracy than their power. The new translation that we require will scarcely be produced by any single scholar, but will rather be one of the fruits of that evangelical German Church, united and flourishing in peace, for which at present we can only work and hope.

(3) Careful attention to the corrections we have made is essential to a proper understanding of the Commentary.

(4) We would also call special attention to the references in our notes to parallel passages in other parts of the Bible. These references will often render further commentary superfluous.

Of course there are many requirements which our Commentary will not satisfy. If the text of the New Testament, the explanation of which as a whole is much more difficult than is usually supposed, is not to be lost in a sea of notes, we must be satisfied to explain what is distinctly unintelligible or difficult, and for the rest be content to set the reader on the right track. If our Commentary should be called upon to answer every justifiable question, it would have to reply, "The world itself could not contain the books that should be written" (John xxi. 25).

(5) In those portions of the Commentary contributed by the late Prof. Bruch and Pastor Lang, the editors have thought right to make no alterations in this edition. In the commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, on the other hand, the alterations have been very numerous, in consequence of the recent active discussions and the still unsettled questions concerning it.

(6) In its third edition, this Commentary continues to appeal to such readers as have attained a certain amount of education. Another edition is in preparation, the work of one hand, and intended to bring our work within reach of all. The one will not supersede the other, but they will supplement each other. The editors trust that, in one form or the other, their Commentary may justify to many in town and village, to teachers, to inquirers and to believers, the saying of Luther: "I know not how strong others may be in the faith. But for myself, were I ever so learned and spiritual, I cannot attain such holiness as some think they possess. With me it is always the same; if I am without the Word, if I do not think upon it and go about with it, there is no Christ within, no aspiration, no spirit; but so soon as I take to myself a psalm or a verse of Scripture, there is light and warmth in my heart, so that I have a new heart and a new spirit. Thus, of all gifts, the gift of the divine Word is the most glorious. He who takes it away, takes the sun out of the universe."

## INTRODUCTION.

### I.—THE ORIGIN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS.

THE period during which the writings of the New Testament were composed, embraces about a hundred years (from 50—60 A.D. to about the middle of the second century). It is doubtful whether we are to regard the Epistle to the Galatians (55-6 A.D.) or the First Epistle to the Thessalonians as the oldest book of the New Testament. The latter, if written by St. Paul, would date from the year 54. In any case, between the time when Jesus “ascended to the Father,” and the composition of the earliest Pauline Epistles, lies a troubled interval of at least twenty years, full of important events. For the first Christians had little or no desire to commit the gospel to writing, and it seems at first scarcely to have occurred to them to hand down to posterity a written account of Christian History and Doctrine. As Luther says in his Commentary on the sections of Scripture appointed to be read in the Church (*Kirchenpostille*), “The Apostles and Evangelists call only the Old Testament the Holy Scripture. For not Scripture, but incarnate living words, were to be the New Testament; wherefore Christ himself wrote nothing, but commanded to preach his gospel by word of mouth.”

“I am come to cast fire upon the earth, and what would I rather than that it were already kindled?” (Luke xii. 49). Thus had Jesus himself expressed the object of his preaching concerning the kingdom of God and of his life as the Son of Man. And

when the hour had passed, at the thought of which he had been “so troubled until it had passed” (Luke xii. 50), the hour of “the baptism with which he must first be baptized,” the hour of the passover of his death, then his last commands, which the disciples heard as they stood thrilled by the sight of his glory, referred neither to the provision of a written record of the new revelation of God in him, nor to new tables of the law like those of stone on which with “His own finger” God engraved His old revelation (Exod. xxxi. 18). The commands which the disciples then received from the Master who had died, and for them had arisen again from the dead, were these: first, in a community at Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 14) to cherish faithfully the flame which had made the “heart burn within” others than the disciples of Emmaus; and then when they had received “power from above,” by the fuel of each one’s speech (Matt. xxviii. 20), to spread this flame throughout “all nations.”

But they were to go, not as messengers of peace, but as bearers of the sword (Luke xii. 51sqq.; Matt. x. 34—36). Spiritual tumult, rebellion against the traditional social arrangements of human nature, such was the “fire” which Jesus himself had promised in mysterious words: “The son against his father, the daughter against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, a man’s foes they of his own household.” In a word, Jesus had demanded the breaking off of all the natural ties of love (Matt. xii. 46—50; Mark iii. 31—35; Luke viii. 19—21), the willing and even enthusiastic renunciation of the life of the natural inclinations and passions, and in its place a new life in the supreme and passionate love of God, and the perfect love of man which flows from it. And thus he had given to his disciples the fundamental commandment of the kingdom of God, upon which hung all the law and the prophets (Matt. xxii. 40). The sceptre of that kingdom he himself won by his Messianic life and received at his death.

This Messianic teaching was very imperfectly understood, even by those who gathered affectionately around Jesus himself. Nay,

even the Master only came gradually to the full recognition of the religious consequences which lay concealed in the divine kernel of his preaching of the kingdom of God. Only by serious reflection and rich experience, in the course of the instructive occurrences of his wanderings in Palestine (comp. Matt. xv. 24 sqq.), and “by still and holy nights of thought and prayer,” did he work his way from the first suspicion of his Jewish Messiahship, to the full consciousness of the fact that he was a spiritual King of humanity. And the disciples were not above their Master. They followed him laboriously afar off, and more than once he reproached them in his impatient anxiety for the kingdom of God. His sayings with regard to the suffering and death that awaited him had sufficed to obscure for a time their expectations of the regal glory of a Messianic kingdom, which was to be established through him in conjunction with themselves. But these sayings had not been sufficient to transfigure and spiritualize their conception of that kingdom. The capture of Jesus was the sign for their flight (Matt. xxvi. 56); the bravest of them “wept bitterly” over his own cowardice; and when the horrible deed was over in Jerusalem, the fugitives did not venture to meet together again until they reached Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 16).

They had only one thing left amid the storm: their *personal* affection for the mysterious being from Nazareth. And when their minds, stirred within them and glowing in the rapture of fresh memory or of sad meditation, saw him, who was dead, standing again before them, each time one thing became more certain: *crucified, he was yet the Messiah.* “*Was it not necessary* that Jesus should suffer such things and enter into his glory?” (Luke xxiv. 26, 46). As they remembered words of prophecy to which they had hitherto not paid sufficient attention, the scales fell, as it were, from their eyes, and their confidence in him was confirmed again. Their faint-heartedness seemed to them folly and sloth (Luke xxiv. 25), culpable disbelief in all that the prophets had written of the Messiah. Isaiah (liii. 2 sqq.) chastened them, and Daniel (vii. 13) raised them up again. The broken

intercourse of their hearts with the Master was restored with new strength and depth of feeling. When they “gather together with one accord” in the temple, they gather together for prayer with him who had promised to build again the temple which was destroyed. They “break bread” in communion with him who a little while before broke bread for them and was betrayed.

This purely personal character of the earliest Christianity gave a powerful impulse to it, but it exerted at the same time a powerful check upon the free action of the primitive Christian spirit.

It gave an *impulse*, for it was this transcendent personal spiritual intercourse between the disciples who were left behind and the Master who was thus exalted, which gave zeal and *warmth* to the religious life of the first Christian community. And it was this warmth of spirit which protected and cherished Christianity, until in the person of Paul a higher *understanding* of Jesus’ teaching of the kingdom of God made its appearance, and handed down the true account of it to future generations. Often in the later history of religious feeling the enthusiastic nature of the first Christian community stormily burst forth again. These were the sacred hours when Christianity renewed its youth at the fountains of its life. But pre-eminent above all else in its persistence stands the primitive Christian enthusiasm called into being by Jesus’ promise of his *return* to establish his kingdom, and kept alive by the vivid and overpowering impression of his first appearance, which had not yet been blanched and weakened by pedantic reflections and speculations. The recency of the earthly life of Jesus, and the universal expectation that he would come again *soon*, combined to inspire the primitive community with this violent enthusiasm. And yet, on the other hand, the delay in the immediate fulfilment of these expectations seemed to afford no reason for allowing the fire of expectation itself to cool. The sayings of Jesus concerning his re-appearance, which were still remembered, were always capable of extension in regard to time: “Verily, I say unto you, *this generation* shall

not pass till all these things be fulfilled" (Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark xiii. 30; Luke xxi. 32); "Verily, I say unto you, there be *some* standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom" (Matt. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27). Thus is explained the unique fact of the most direct, enthusiastic, Christian, spiritual life surviving from year to year with undiminished power. And by means of this fact we are able to comprehend two others: on the one hand, the undaunted spirit with which the first apostles preached the "*crucified Messiah*," though they knew that, in spite of its corresponding in many points with ancient national prophecy, this must ever seem to the predominant spirit of Judaism a desecration of all that was most sacred to the people (see p. 8); and, on the other hand, the confidence of minds which were satisfied, and more than satisfied, in their own religion, with which the first apostles defended their gospel against the Apostle of the Gentiles, "born out of due season," yet in many respects so superior to them in mental and spiritual power.

A serious contest within the Christian community itself was inevitable, for the purely personal character of the primitive Christian piety acted at the same time as a *restraint* against which the deepest principle of Christianity was compelled to rebel, in order to maintain its own existence.

So long as the inner relation to the crucified Messiah remained *only* one of feeling, and sought for no logical foundation or expression, the Christ who was preached at Jerusalem must continue to be identical with the Christ with whom the apostles had lived, and whose fears and hopes they had shared; the Christ whom Peter had confessed in the name of the whole circle of the disciples (Matt. xvi. 19); the Christ or Messiah of *Israel*, and as such the Son of the living God. For Peter himself, speaking for the other disciples, proceeded at once to make it clear that he acknowledged Jesus only as the Messiah of the hopes of the Jewish people, to the great indignation of the Master himself (Matt. xvi. 21—23). And in spite of repeated correc-

tion, the national Messianic hope re-appears again and again among the first apostles, and is supported by the amazing manifestations of personal power on the part of their Master (comp. Matt. xvii. 23, xx. 19—21, xxvi. 31). Even when he had died upon the cross, the question, “Ought he not to have suffered such things?” had its source in the return to their memory of passages in the writings of their national prophets. Whenever Jesus had told them of the sufferings that awaited him, they had been “troubled.” And when these sufferings came upon him, they were “an offence,” and the disciples fled. When the days of terror were past, and he who was dead appeared to them, the sight of his glory gathered them together again, and, seeing the royal glory of the resurrection, they believed the saying, *Crucified, and yet the Messiah.* “Jesus of Nazareth,” of whom David and the prophets bear witness, is the subject of Peter’s first speech (Acts ii. sqq.). The perversity of the Jews who persecuted and slew the prophets of old, which has now culminated in the crucifixion of “this just One,” is the subject of Stephen’s speech (Acts vii.). In addition to this purely national conception of the Messiahship of Jesus, arising from the personal relation of the first apostles to the transfigured Jesus of Nazareth, two other circumstances tended to make the first Christian community simply a “sect of the Nazarenes” (Acts xxiv. 5):—on the one hand, the woes of their country, whose most sacred possessions suffered increasing wrong at the hands of the Roman emperors, and which was regarded for that very reason with a deeper, warmer love by all the faithful sons of Palestine, and faithful guardians of the honour of the temple; and, on the other hand, the various points of contact which the primitive apostolic view offered on its religious side, not only to the universally recognized prophecies of the Old Testament, but also to the tendencies of contemporary sects and parties.

Even the sect of the Pharisees, the democratic party of the faithful adherents of the law (the strength of which dates from the severe contest in the second century B.C. with the nation’s

hereditary enemies of Syria), seemed, in spite of its cruel opposition to the Christianity of the Nazarenes, to render a complete rupture with the national religion unadvisable in more respects than one. The original influence of the spirit of this party upon the training of Jesus himself, was no less certain than the irreconcilable opposition between the Pharisees and the Master which gradually developed in the course of his life. And after the death of Jesus, their common zeal for the privileges of Israel and for the maintenance of the ancient law (Acts xxi. 20), and an agreement in opinion as to the future of the Messiah, formed a bond of union between them, not openly acknowledged indeed, but concealed beneath their various feuds. The same thing was true in a still greater degree of the Essenes, though they had of course far less influence in the nation. It is certainly very evident that in Jesus there was little of the artificial mystery of a "master of the order of Essenes" (comp. Matt. v. 14—16), and that neither he nor the religion which he founded show any clear traces of a marked Essenic influence; but it is equally evident that there was an unsought fellowship between the Essenic and the primitive Christian spirit, in the strictness of morals bordering upon asceticism, in the sentiment of "an all-embracing human love," in the rejection of sacrifice, and in the ecstatic communion of daily worship.

Thus the personal origin of primitive apostolic Christianity, and the national ties of blood and affection, united to confine Christianity within the limits of Palestine, in spite of its natural tendency to press forwards, and the powerful impulses of its early enthusiasm. The commission "to all nations" was soon forgotten.

But it was impossible that it should not come back to their memory. For it lay in germ in the very doctrine of a crucified Messiah. Misunderstood at Jerusalem, it comes in the solitude of Hauran (see Vol. II., Introd. to the Pauline Epistles), and knocks at the heart of an apostle "born out of due season." A gospel of Paul first takes its stand by the side of the gospel of

Peter and his companions, then takes a position opposed to it, and yet rests all the time upon the very same ground.

Crucified, and yet the Messiah,—this to the personal disciples of Jesus was the expression of their love and their hopes ; to Paul it was the enigma of his life and his thought. And he solved it by drawing from this one gospel two new conclusions :

If Jesus be the Messiah and yet crucified, then he is not the Messiah of the Jews alone. For the crucified Messiah stands in the sharpest opposition to *their* Messiah. The old Jewish prophets could imagine a Messiah suffering for a time ; but they could never imagine a Messiah crucified. If salvation comes through such an one, then it comes to the heathen also (Gal. iii. 13, 14). Thus the gospel was delivered from Jewish exclusiveness, and its *universal* application was secured.

And again, if Jesus be the Messiah and yet crucified, a king and yet visited by the suffering of shame in the sight of men, and a curse in the sight of God, such shameful woe in him, who was to be the fairest of the sons of men, could not be the result of chance, but must be founded in the will of God for the salvation of man ; it must be the offering of reconciliation for the sins of men, the true foundation of a *new* kingdom of Jesus Christ, a moral kingdom. Thus the gospel was delivered from the law, the formality, the “carnality” of Judaism, and its *spiritual* nature was preserved (comp. Introd. to Ep. to Rom. and Ep. to Gal.).

Thus the Christianity of an improved Jewish *law* and a privileged Jewish *nationality* is met by Christianity as the religion of the *Spirit* (“Idealism”) and as the religion of *Humanity* (“Universalism”), making new demands upon individuals and new claims upon the community of nations. Only the final *goal* remained the same in both cases ; viz. the return of Jesus Christ to establish his kingdom. It was inevitable that the paths of the gospel of Paul and the gospel of Peter should divide. It was equally inevitable that they should re-unite. In the midst of such contests and such reconciliations the writings of the New Testament have their origin.

## THE PERIOD DOWN TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

At Antioch the die was cast. There Paul broke away from the principles of the primitive apostolic preaching (see Vol. II., Introd. to the Pauline Epistles). There he separated for a time from Barnabas, who had hitherto been his most faithful friend (Gal. ii. 13, comp. 2 Cor. ix. 6). The position of the two parties with regard to one another did not remain the same, and the Jewish Christians were far from following always and everywhere the noble and wise example of the three older apostles. Before the division took place at Antioch, Paul had promised to make a collection for the community at Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 10). He kept the promise in his heart that he might show his friendly feeling in spite of opposing opinions, and worked far harder than he was now in any way bound to do to carry it out thoroughly. But at the very time that he was thus engaged, he was dogged at every step by the active opposition of Jewish Christian depreciation, slander and bigotry.

Shut out from Palestine (Gal. ii. 7), and finding Asia Minor too narrow a sphere for his activity, in obedience to a vision he ventured upon the most important and, since the events which had taken place in Antioch, the most decisive step in his life. He crossed over to Europe (53 A.D.), and here at last his labours lay beyond the reach of the Jewish Christians and their emissaries. In Philippi he has to deal with mercenary heathen, and there, in the house of Lydia the dyer in purple, he finds the first little Christian community upon European soil. In Thessalonica, fanatical, stiff-necked Jews (1 Thess. ii. 14—16; Acts xvii. 5) drive him from the more important and influential church recently founded there, and this induces him to write from Corinth *the First Epistle to the Thessalonians* (A.D. 54. There are some scholars who consider that this Epistle is not genuine). Still he could not satisfy his longing personally to foster the young community which had been so happily planted

in the chief city of Macedonia. Twice “Satan” hindered him (1 Thess. ii. 18), and it was this hindrance alone which induced him to write the letter to the Thessalonians of which we have spoken. The object of this Epistle is to confirm his gospel amongst them against the attacks of the Jews, and especially so to strengthen and at the same time calm their expectations of the return of Christ, that their moral conduct, the good order of the congregation and the cheerfulness of their own minds, may further testify to the power of the gospel of Christ. A second Epistle followed, but this has not been preserved to us in its original form. The Christians of Thessalonica, who were mostly Gentiles, could not adapt themselves properly to the idea of the return of Christ, an idea which was new and strange to them. One part of the community makes the Messianic expectation a plea for dishonouring the doctrine of the cross by indolence and all manner of disorder arising therefrom (2 Thess. iii. 12), and makes the church a spectacle to the Jews. Then the apostle is compelled once more to supply the want of his personal presence by a letter of reproof, in which he earnestly calls the disorderly and idle to order and quiet industry in the peace of God (2 Thess. iii. 12—18), as the best preparation for the return of the Lord.

And yet while the apostle writes thus, he is reaping in Corinth the very fruit which the Jewish Christians most envied the preachers of the gospel to the Gentiles. There is no place on the line of Paul’s first European journey where his preaching was in a greater degree, what he himself afterwards boasts of with gratitude, “a manifestation of the Spirit” (1 Cor. ii. 4). There was no place where he had been more forcibly compelled, even by external circumstances, to seek the power of his preaching in the original contents of the Word of the Cross, and in the simple revelation of the Divine will for our salvation free from every human addition and support (1 Cor. i. 23). It is to the Corinthians that he confesses, “When I am weak, then am I strong” (2 Cor. xii. 10), for amongst them he learnt it. There, in view of Acrocorinth, with its citadel and temples, dwelling in the midst of the whirl-

of wealth, science and art, if he wished to be strong after the fashion of Corinth he was nothing, and yet in the power of the Cross of Christ he could do all things,—could stay the tide of the fashionable life of that great city in heathen hearts, and secure a hearing for rude and homely speech concerning sin and salvation. And finally, in no place had his preaching kindled a more vigorous flame; the warmest fire of Messianic enthusiasm of which primitive Christianity had ever been capable, was here united with the direct action of the spirit free from the law, and the divine “gifts of grace” (1 Cor. xii.) of the first Christian inspiration, richer here than in any other of the Christian churches, seemed to vouch for a long continuance of the freshness of the life of the church at Corinth.

But from this lofty peak of inward and outward success, the apostle was soon to descend to the depths of bitter disenchantment and passionate defence against odious opponents. When he leaves Corinth (A.D. 55), and visits the churches in Asia Minor which he had founded on his two previous missionary journeys, and among them those in the “land of Galatia” (Acts xvi. 6), he finds the seed which he had scattered there is poisoned by the influence of the Jewish-Christian party, more especially in those very congregations of Galatia which formerly, under the powerful impression made by his person and his speech, esteemed him worthy of divine honours (Gal. iv. 14), and now actually listened to teachers who would not even acknowledge his apostolic office. He exerted himself, not without success, to restore again the fitting relations between himself and his “little children” (Gal. iv. 19). But scarcely has he turned away again to pursue his journey to Ephesus, when his opponents renew their attack upon him and his preaching. And the “foolish,” who allow themselves a second time to be bewitched, compel him, in the passionate words of the Epistle to the Galatians (A.D. 55, 56), to give historical proof of his complete apostolic equality with the first apostles, and to renounce the privileges of Israel as swallowed up in the liberty with which Christ has made us free (Gal. v. 1). Finally, when

from Ephesus he has so far restored due order in Galatia that he is able as an apostle of Jesus Christ to make arrangements in the churches there for the “collection” about which he was so anxious (1 Cor. xvi. 1), he is troubled by sad news from Corinth. Fierce dissensions have brought desolation into the churches there.

As if Christ were divided, two parties stand opposed in feud with one another. Jewish-Christian intruders, on the one hand, have made the followers of Paul and Apollos (see Introd. to Heb.) into mere Pauline zealots, on the other hand; and have thus brought on an uncharitable contest in the church. The one party misused the name of Peter and even the sublime majesty of Jesus Christ himself in their contest with the gospel of the Gentiles. The others exaggerated the true Christian greatness of the apostle Paul till they almost made him equal to the Redeemer (1 Cor. i. 12, 13). This contest most seriously endangered the moral improvement which had been so laboriously attained, and the pious order of the life of the community. But the apostle could not long remain ignorant on which side the disturbance had arisen. He is impelled to go and oppose those who thus disturbed the peace of the church face to face. Meanwhile he twice calls both parties to order by letters from Ephesus. (The first of these letters is lost, the second is our *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, written in the spring of the year 78.) Then he sets off to travel through Macedonia to Greece. It would surely seem that he might hope that the hymn of love, which he had dedicated to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiii.), had kindled a fire in their hearts which would cleanse and purify both their individual character and the life of the church. But the journey itself is embittered by fresh news of the lapse of a part of the community. From Macedonia (in the autumn of 58) he is compelled in a third letter (our *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*) to pour out the vials of his wrath upon their personal faithlessness to him, which he never feels so bitterly as now, and at the same time upon their forgetfulness of the divine confirmation of his

gospel. Only when he has been able (in the winter of 58-59), by months of personal intercourse with the community, to make them feel the weight of his glowing love and earnest zeal, does he so far restore the power of his gospel here that he is able to turn his attention to Rome. In the spring of 59, he quietly and earnestly lays the foundation of his gospel among the believers in Rome, who were mostly Jewish Christians, and effectually disposes of the charges of his opponents there (see Vol. II., Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans).

The Epistle, as is clearly stated, was only intended to be a harbinger of the apostle himself. Some thirty months afterwards he came to Rome as a prisoner (in the latter part of the year 61). But he is weary. He "desires to depart." A token of the love which the church at Philippi bears him comes to him like a warm breath of life. Ever since his first journey into Greece, its members have remained faithful, and clung to him with genuine Macedonian endurance, and now they send him, by the hand of their teacher Epaphroditus, a contribution in money to supply his wants in his imprisonment (Phil. iv. 18). But even while he thanks them, in the *Epistle to the Philippians* (which is most probably genuine) for this sign of their heartfelt sympathy, the apostle cannot altogether repress his displeasure at the continual return of the old opposition. The same tone pervades an Epistle to the Colossians, written about the same time; and this in spite of the active influence at Colossæ of Philemon, strong in the faith, and so trusty a friend and fellow-labourer that Paul could without hesitation send back to him a slave, Onesimus, who had run away from him, simply begging him, in the *Epistle to Philemon* (either from Rome or Cæsarea), to forgive him. Philemon was not yet able successfully to overcome those who oppressed men's consciences with Jewish-Christian ordinances (Col. ii. 16 sqq.). But the opposition of the Jewish Christians had lost its vital power. At Colossæ, it dealt only with external observances, and became a bigoted adherence to laws concerning meats and drink (Col. ii. 21). At Philippi, it had not yet made way into

the church which Paul had founded, and the apostle could still hope that his own followers might repulse it as they had hitherto done (Phil. iii 1, 2). Though the captious attacks of the Jewish Christians still disgust him, even now when they can no longer have any reasonable hope of overcoming him, he is filled with the hope of victory, and exhorts his faithful comrades to be of good cheer (Phil. iv. 1), for the Lord is at hand. For him truly the Lord is at hand. Paul dies (A.D. 64), and one of the last pictures that floats before his vision is Humanity kneeling at the feet of Jesus, the whole creation humbled before him in the dust (Phil. ii 10).

The death of Paul and the rebellion of the Jews (A.D. 66) are the two events the consequences of which determine the course of Christianity in the years immediately following. The gospel of the Gentiles is deprived of its natural protector. Jewish Christianity, with the revolutionary element of Judaism itself, is in danger of the same fate.

The former must strive to the best of its power to heal the wound which the year 64 has inflicted upon its life and activity; and in circles friendly to Paul, though with many departures from fundamental Pauline principles, arises the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. The latter—Jewish Christianity—must be careful to secure to the community of believers the picture of the Master, his words and deeds, his death and resurrection, that it may not be lost when they are scattered in times of distress, or are even in danger of being completely absorbed again. With this view, the *Gospel according to Matthew* is composed (though some would place this later). The Epistle to the Hebrews warns its Jewish-Christian readers (in Alexandria or Rome) to beware of falling back into Judaism, but its chief object is to promote peace between the contending parties. Its testimony to the infinite exaltation of the high-priestly office of Jesus above that of Judaism is at the same time a solemn exhortation to the Jewish Christians to renounce their claims to any superior privileges. The Gospel according to Matthew, while collecting into a whole

the fragments of written tradition (see pp. 39—45), and constructing from them a picture of Jesus as the Messiah and of his life, lays the greatest emphasis upon the conservative position of Jesus with regard to the law (Matt. v. 17 sqq.), his faithful adherence to Jewish customs, and the fact that he always remained within the limits of Palestine. But at the same time it takes account of the fact of Gentile Christianity (see pp. 43 sq.), and a place in the kingdom of heaven, though a very humble one, is reserved for the Christians who in the name of Jesus are unfaithful to the Mosaic law (v. 19). Must not the first traces of such toleration be the result of the sufferings which they endured at the hands of a common enemy ? And is not this enemy Nero, the imperial monster of Rome, to whose insane cruelty Paul had fallen a victim a short time before ? And, again, was it not Nero, who was said to be dead, but whom the Jewish Christians expected to return in the form of Antichrist (see Introd. to Rev.), that from him the last bitter woes might fall upon Jerusalem and the temple of God ?

But surely these woes were the last. The prospects of the Jewish rebellion were daily becoming darker, and anxious forebodings were spreading among the sons of Palestine and the friends of the sanctuary at Jerusalem, when at Ephesus a Christian seer, perhaps the apostle John, the Son of Thunder, lifted up his voice in words of comfort, and pointed to the glorious victory that lay before the churches of Christ, waiting only until the evil in all its anti-christian fulness should have become incarnate, in order that the Son of Man, descending in the clouds of heaven, might destroy it for ever. The army of Vespasian marches against the holy city. Hopeless ruin threatens the ancient Jerusalem. Then the *Revelation of John* (A.D. 69) proclaims the New Jerusalem which shall arise in all the brilliancy of pure gold and with walls of jasper. The hour of Antichrist draws near. Once already Roman madness in the person of Caligula has demanded divine honours in the temple of God ; now the sacrilege is about to be completed. Then the Revelation, with heaven-assailing fervour, beseeches the Lord to come and deliver his people, and hears

his answer as he hastens to the victory (Rev. xix. 11—16), “Yea, I come quickly” (Rev. xxii. 20).

#### THE FIFTY YEARS FOLLOWING THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

During the next half century we see a gradual decline of the internal conflicts of Christianity. The main causes of this are evident. First came the disappointment, shared by all alike, of the expectation which formed the central point of all the hopes of the first Christians. This was strongest among the Jewish Christians, who found the turning point of their whole life in the great catastrophe of Judea. But is it possible to suppose that of all the Messianic expectations which Christians cherished in common, just those which were most deeply felt among the Palestinian Christians awoke no echo in the Gentile Christian world? Apart from the special representation of Antichrist which is determined by later historical events, was Paul’s description of the return of Christ (1 Thess. iv. 13—v. 8) inconsistent with the prophecies of John? The trumpet has sounded over the saints of God with more than sevenfold power (Rev. viii. 6; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 52), but it is the trumpet of the victorious Romans. The cry of battle resounds across the city over which Jesus wept, but the graves have not opened. The disappointed followers of Paul need the same comfort and the same strength as those of John, for both alike find their Christianity shaken to its foundations. Perhaps it was at this time that the *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* was put into the form in which it has reached us. If so, a genuine Second Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians (see p. 10), the original contents of which afforded the greatest facility for the addition of the exhortation and consolation which Christianity so urgently required from the year 70 onwards, must have been put into circulation afresh, with the addition of some interpolations referring to the prophecies of John. By its Pauline origin, and its actual though unexpressed reference to the Johan-

nine prophecy concerning Antichrist, it would be especially adapted to soothe and confirm both sections of the Christian community. "Be not shaken in your mind concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him" (2 Thess. ii. 1, 2). Thus the Apostle Paul must then have written the second time, and then must have been added the words, "And ye know what withholdeth it" (2 Thess. ii. 6 sqq.; see Vol. II., Introd. to 2 Thess.), viz., the Roman government, which continued to exist for a time.

However this may be, there was, besides the disappointments of the year 70, and the later common sufferings of the persecutions which lasted till the death of Trajan, another very different event, far more important than all the rest, which also tended gradually to remove the internal dissensions of Christianity, and to prepare the way for a universal Christian Church in the regions of Pauline and Petrine missionary effort. This was the removal of the centre of Christian life to *Rome*. With the destruction of the temple and the decay of the first Christian Messianic hopes, Jerusalem inevitably fell from the important position it held with regard to the future consciousness of Christianity. The capital of the world naturally and even necessarily appropriated the inheritance of the Jewish capital, an inheritance certainly of doubtful value to Rome itself. This event affected the whole of Christianity, enlarged the sphere of vision of both the contending parties, and plainly showed both the adherents of the law and those who were free from the law, the necessity of mutual advances, and a closer external union in the interests of Christianity generally, and in opposition to the heathen empire of the world. Under its influence proceeded from the Petrine party (70—90 A.D.) the *Gospel according to Mark* (pp. 45—47), in conciliatory opposition to the increasing hostility of the anti-Pauline school, which then found expression in the *Epistle of James* (written according to some scholars before 69 A.D.). On the Pauline side, the *Gospel according to Luke* (about 100 A.D.) and the *Acts of the Apostles* by the same writer (100—120 A.D.), undertake to justify on historical

grounds the more peaceful relations which events had gradually established in the actual life of the Christian communities (see Introductions to these books). The *First Epistle of Peter*, in didactic form, pronounces its blessing upon the attempt.

#### THE TWO PARTIES UNITE AGAINST A COMMON FOE.

Even in the second century the traces of this ancient dissension are not extinguished, and down to its very close the remains of the old party fanaticism occasionally make unnatural efforts to revive. But the two schools make common cause against the most dangerous of all opponents, and are thereby so firmly united that all attempts at division, after a short and only apparent success, fail to destroy the sympathy of a common tradition and a common danger. The enemy that was now to be overcome could not but appear more dangerous than the Roman persecution. It was an enemy within the camp. The contact of Christian ideas with the philosophy of Alexandria, the influence of which had powerfully affected the intellectual life of the imperial capital, gave rise in the second century to a school of philosophers (Gnostics) who thought that they should be doing a service to Christianity, and at the same time providing themselves with the worthiest subject of thought and means of mental training, if in the consciousness of the transforming power of the gospel they could lift the appearance and significance of Jesus Christ above the limits of the personal life of the Saviour, and assign him a place in an intellectual system which should embrace the Divine nature and the material universe. Christianity aimed at becoming the universal religion. Must not its Founder then prove to be one of the powers of the universe, whose supernatural home, whose kinship with the Deity, were the justification of this aim and the pledges of victory? This question found an echo in the Christendom of that age, and to many it seemed self-evident that it must be answered in the affirmative. But while by these advances they sought to do honour to their Lord and Master, they were unconsciously

drinking in a dangerous poison. All the Gnostic systems which we shall have to consider (see Introduction to First and Second Epistles to Timothy) had one thing in common; they saw in Christ *one among many* lower divine beings which streamed from the eternal and unapproachable source of the Deity, with a gradual diminution of their Divine nature, until at last, through the lowest and feeblest, the contact of God with the material world appeared possible. It is evident that the person of the Redeemer was thus removed from the commanding central point of the scheme of salvation.

The first century had secured to Christendom its spirituality and the universality of its mission to mankind. The second was taken up in strenuous exertions (compared with which those which were made after the destruction of Jerusalem appeared insignificant) to preserve its *Christianity*, to establish the position of Christ as unique and incomparable, the author and finisher of the salvation of the individual and of humanity. This is more or less exclusively the one object of the rest of the New Testament literature. According to the custom of Christian antiquity, which even in the fifth or sixth century allowed the founder of Greek mysticism in perfect innocence to shelter his Christian ideas under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts xvii. 34), writers now avail themselves of the respect in which John, Peter and Paul are alike held, and turn it to literary account. Far surpassing all the rest in intrinsic value, in philosophic culture, and in the poetic charm of its style, stand peerless at the head of the list the *Gospel of John* and its twin-brother the *First Epistle of John*. Then follow the *Epistle to the Ephesians* and the *Epistle to the Colossians* in its present form; then the erroneously so-called “Second” *Epistle to Timothy*, the *Epistle to Titus*, *First Timothy*, the *Second Epistle of John*; and then probably, as the last members of this family (after 150 A.D.), the *Epistle of Jude* and the *Second Epistle of Peter* (see the respective Introductions). In addition to the predominant characteristic of all these writings, each one has its peculiar form and its special object. But

though the emphasis might be laid now upon the complete unity of Christ with God and his exclusive mediatorship for humanity, now upon the unity of the life of the Christian community in Christ the one Head, and again, finally, upon the fact that Christ is not one member of a varied series of divine natures, but that in him the *fulness* of the Godhead appeared in human form ; still the one object always was to grasp the right expression for the fundamental principle of Christianity, which the "Revelation" declared in the words, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord" (Rev. i. 8, 11, xxi. 6, xxii. 13).

Upon this ground which it had now acquired, the "universal" (catholic) Church rested in its first modest beginning. In the year 167, the community at Sinyrna reports the death of its bishop Polycrates to catholic sister churches. Even contention as to the paschal festival cannot long disturb the brotherly intercourse of the Christian people, which now extends far and wide ; and the *Third Epistle of John* brings the powerful authority of the son of Zebedee to bear in exhorting the various communities, and especially the superiors, to show hospitality to travelling "evangelists," and to afford them every assistance and support in their journeys.

What, then, is the sum of all this ? Traces of severe internal strife run through the whole of our New Testament literature. But Christianity only issues from it purified, free, confirmed. Its spirituality (John iv. 24), its destiny to embrace the whole world (John x. 16), are universally recognized. And whereas its first sally into the heathen world was an occasion of division in the camp itself, it can now with united forces make a second sally, still more confident of victory, since it has now a sure guiding star which will show the way in every zone, and in the most distant and unknown regions (John xiv. 5). The First Epistle of John proclaims a faith which has victoriously overcome the world (v. 5). It is this faith which now conquers what has hitherto been invincible, a defiant Roman world.

## II.—HOLY SPIRIT AND HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Complete historical truth, then, especially in relation to the New Testament, is unconditionally on the side of those who reverence the unique and visible influence of the Spirit of God in these writings, and for that very reason absolutely reject the doctrine of their “inspiration” as held by the ancient Church.

Protestant investigation of the New Testament writings has brought to light one portion of the history of the Holy Spirit itself, but it is the history of the spirit of God engaged in a great contest, and the field of action is in men and among men.

Many years after Luther with the power of the Bible had shaken the strongholds of the Church of Rome to their foundations, there arose a doctrine concerning the Bible which appealed to him, and enjoyed the protection of the authority of the ecclesiastical powers. This doctrine made “the Bible” and “the Word of God” synonymous, and declared that the former was merely the dictation of the Holy Spirit, that the sacred writers were its “pens” or “secretaries,” and that the Bible therefore constituted a manual of Christianity, and was, in the first place, simply a vessel containing a purely divine substance unaffected by any independent literary co-operation; in the second place, uniformly, in all its parts, the very word of God; and finally, as the logical consequence of this, incapable of error in any point. While every school of modern Protestant theological inquiry has been liberating itself from this tradition of the uniform divine truth of the Bible, the distortion of the so-called “Scripture principle” of the Reformation, which was brought to a climax with pernicious zeal in the seventeenth century, has exerted, and still exerts, a bewildering influence which is incredibly powerful, and which can only be compared with that of the Romish Papal fables of the middle ages. And the effect of this was to impoverish the Bible itself. If the sacred writers are really regarded as the instruments from which the Holy Spirit

with his sounding-rod drew whatever melodies pleased him, if they were simply the “pipes” upon which he played his favourite airs, what was more natural than the endeavour to keep from the Bible every appearance of discord or of contradiction? All the great and varied history of primitive Christianity was violently compressed within the narrow ruts of a meagre uniformity. The sacred writers were degraded, for henceforth they were to be regarded as the servants, not the children, of the Holy Spirit; and so too was the Holy Spirit itself, for only through the servile offices of servants was it to be able to rule in the children of God who had been called to liberty.

#### LUTHER'S VIEW OF SCRIPTURE.

This conception of Scripture just mentioned, with its raw materialism, appeals to the authority of Luther. Let Luther speak for himself:

1. “All that the apostles taught and wrote, they drew from the Old Testament. For the New Testament is no more than a revelation of the Old. It is as if a man had a closed letter, and afterwards broke the seal. So the Old Testament is Christ's letter, which he opened after his death, and caused to be read and proclaimed everywhere through the Gospel.

“God gave to the Jews a written law, that is, the Ten Commandments, superfluously; for they are nothing else than the law of nature, which is by nature written in our heart.”

These words of Luther's are sufficient to show that he neither regarded the literary activity of the apostles as independent of the natural national religion of Israel, nor the latter, even in its noblest parts, as the inspiration of the Divine Spirit without the co-operation of natural human reason.

2. The following words of Luther will show that he made great distinctions as to the comparative value of the different books of the Bible:

“The Old Testament is night and darkness in comparison with

the New. And where the Old Testament is best preserved, men's consciences are only terrified at it."

"We will not regard Moses as our lawgiver except he accord with the New Testament and the natural law. Therefore I keep the commandments which Moses gave, not because Moses commanded them, but because they are implanted in me by nature."

"In St. Paul's Epistles the gospel is clearer and brighter than in the four Evangelists; for the four Evangelists described Christ's life and words, which were not understood until after the advent of the Holy Spirit. But St. Paul writes nothing of the life of Christ, but expresses clearly why he came and how we should avail ourselves of him." —(Because) "therefore the Gospel of John is the one tender, right chief Gospel. And so, too, the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter far excel the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. In sum, the Gospel of St. John and his First Epistle, the Epistles of St. Paul, especially those to the Romans, Galatians and Ephesians, and the First Epistle of St. Peter, these are the books which show thee Christ, and teach thee all that it is needful and blessed for thee to know, even if thou

hearest no other book." "Therefore the Epistle of St. James is an Epistle of straw in comparison with them, for it has nothing evangelical about it. The Epistle to the Romans is the true masterpiece of the New Testament, and the purest Gospel of all." —"We will let [the Epistle of James] go along with the rest, for those who wish to keep it, .. that it may not be thought that we would absolutely reject it, although the Epistle is not written by an apostle, nor altogether of true apostolic kind and stamp, nor entirely in accordance with pure doctrine."

3. Further, that the decision as to the greater or lesser value of any Biblical writing is to be left to the testing power of the evangelic conscience, is shown by the following passages: "We must not consider simply the question whether it be God's word, or whether God hath said it, but rather to whom it is said. One thing concerns me not, another touches me."

"God hath commanded that in matters of faith we should not have regard to any apostle, nor prophet, nor to any other. If they bring God's word, we bid them welcome in God's name. But if it be not God's word, we dismiss them." "It is recorded of Virgil that, having the poet Ennius in his hand, and one asking him what he was doing, he replied, that he was picking gold out of the mire of Ennius. So one might call this, our Lord Christ's gold in the mire, or a precious pearl in the mire. Happy were he who could gather such gold from the paper, from the poor letters and the simple words!"

4. And finally, that the question of the genuineness and historical origin of the Biblical books, and whether they have been accurately preserved to us or not, is to be decided by rational investigation only, is shown first in regard to the Apocrypha by the following expressions :

"The Book of Judith will scarcely fit in with the histories of the Holy Scripture. The reader should regard it as a sacred spiritual poem." "The Wisdom of Solomon judaizes to so great a degree that the Fathers of the Church not without reason held Philo to be the author of this book." "The Book of Tobit is a right fair and profitable poem, the play of a witty poet." "Jesus Sirach hath collected together what is best from many books." "Very slight is the Book of Baruch. We let it go with the rest." "The Second Book of the Maccabees appears to have been patched together out of many books."

And in regard to the books of the Old and New Testament which are received by the Church, the same thing is expressed in the following passages :

"Ecclesiastes has been put together by learned men. The Book of the Proverbs of Solomon also has been pieced together by others. Likewise the Song of Solomon appears also to be a book patched together. Hence, also, no order is preserved in these books." "It seems as though Jeremiah did not compose such books himself." "It appears as though Hosea's prophecy were not written down full and entire, but

certain parts of his discourses were brought together into one book."

"Whether the text (1 Pet. iv. 6) has come down to us entire, or whether something has fallen out, I know not."

"And this (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16) is one of the sayings that might move one to hold that this Epistle is not St. Peter's. For he descends somewhat below the apostolic spirit. Yet it is conceivable that it is none the less the apostle's."

"The Epistle of St. Jude is assigned to the holy apostle St. Jude. But it has not the appearance of being the true apostle's. It is probable that some other pious man wrote this Epistle." "The Epistle of St. Jude is an abstract or copy of St. Peter's Second Epistle. It is an unnecessary Epistle." "The Epistle to the Hebrews is not St. Paul's, nor any apostle's. Methinks it is an Epistle composed of many pieces (perhaps long after the time of apostles), and it is by no means on a par with the apostolic Epistles."—(St. James' Epistle) "I do not esteem as the writing of an apostle. But this James drives us to the law and its works, and confuses one thing with another so unskilfully, that methinks it must have been some good, pious man that put down on paper some sayings of the disciples of the apostles long after St. Peter and St. Paul. Therefore I cannot place it among the true chief books." "I hold this book (The Revelation) neither apostolic nor prophetic and I can see no sign that it was under the direction of the Holy Spirit. My spirit cannot enter into the book. I esteem it not highly."

Such is Luther's "Scriptural principle." It did not hinder him from declaring, in opposition to the claims of ecclesiastical *tradition*, that the Holy Scripture was the sole source and rule of evangelical truth. It did not forbid him to estimate the value of the "simple" and "plain" word of the Bible as higher than that of any other visible thing, "higher than heaven and earth," and in its ultimate religious contents "altogether beyond our grasp." It did not hinder him from occasionally, when it "concerned" him, arbitrarily straining some word of the Bible in order

to prove some Christian doctrine which appeared to him necessary. Nor has it preserved him from errors here and there in his first attempt at an historical investigation of the Biblical writings. And finally, it did not allow him to perceive the full results in the future of his declaration of independence.

But he is the worst possible authority for the verbal infallibility of the Bible, and hence for the infallibility of the Bible altogether. For the Christian value of the Holy Scriptures may be variously estimated, and so may their historical credibility; but with regard to the *infallibility of the letter* of the Bible, there is no “more” or “less,” but only “either or.” Either the letter is infallible, or it is not; i.e. either it is infallible everywhere, or it is infallible nowhere. And if this doctrine of infallibility is to be regarded as a command, we must obey absolutely; but if it is to be a matter for investigation and proof with regard to individual portions of Scripture, it is submitted to fallible human judgment and is ipso facto annulled.

So then it is good evangelicalism, and indeed essentially good Lutheranism, to believe, (1) concerning “*The Authority of the Bible*,” that it is founded on a becoming reverence for the Holy Scripture as the channel of Christian truth, but that it is nowhere binding in the letter; (2) concerning “*The Word of God*,” that it is in the Holy Scripture as the good news of the grace of God in Jesus Christ, but that it must never be confounded with the letter of any of the sacred writings; (3) concerning “*The Inspiration of the Bible by the Holy Spirit*,” that the abundant revelations of the Divine Spirit lifted the first bearers of Christian truth far above their surroundings in piety, but never infused into them a definite expression of the saving will of God in Christ, which should be binding for ever; and further, that this “Inspiration” did not cease when the Bible was completed, but is still the mainspring of the Christian life.

And this belief concerning the Bible is especially Biblical.

At the very time when the earliest Christian literature was attaining more general recognition and honour in Christendom,

the *authority* of every “divinely-inspired writing” was made to rest upon its *profitableness* for doctrine, for punishment, for correction, for discipline in righteousness (2 Tim. iii. 16).

And the “*Word of God*”? Once only was it, according to the Johannine conception, “made flesh” (John i. 14), and in him from whom we have not a single written word. “Man lives by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God” (Matt. iv. 4),—that is, by the unintermittent creative word of the Almighty power that sustains the world. Paul regards his own preaching as “in truth the Word of God” (1 Thess. ii. 13). He does not mean his canonical Epistles, for he is at the very time only writing the first of them, but his message of the grace of God in Christ, which he derives “not from men,” but rather from the direct witness which the living Jesus bears to himself in his conversion, in the success of his apostolic labours, and also in his apostolic tribulation.

And finally, the “*Holy Spirit*. ” Its revelations are to testify of Jesus to his disciples (John xv. 26), and they lead into all truth (John xvi. 13). But we nowhere read that this “truth from the Spirit” is *comprehensible* in adequate human language. The *incomprehensibility* of the manner in which it bloweth is expressed in this very book (John iii. 8); its fruits are described as altogether spiritual (Gal. v 22). And where the Holy Spirit grants its highest revelation to the first Christians, or takes the deepest and most convulsive hold of their souls, there appears the unutterable vision of ecstasy (2 Cor. xii. 4), or the holy excitement followed by utter exhaustion, when the word dies on the tongue, and he of whose soul the Spirit has taken possession, faint with the enjoyment of heavenly delight, utters unintelligible sounds (1 Cor. xiv. 2—33, xii. 10; see commentary on Acts ii. 4, 10, 46, xix. 6).

### III.—THE VARIOUS KINDS OF INTERPRETATION.

The oldest method of interpreting the New Testament is the symbolical. It rests upon the example of Jesus and the apostles in their interpretation of the Old Testament. The main object of their interpretation was to find in the Old Testament documents prophetic symbols of the New Testament and the history of Jesus, which should be as “bridges to unite the memories with the hopes of the nation,” and the transition to the allegorical method was an easy one. In Alexandria, a literary school, formed under Greek influence, had long sought out deeply-hidden meanings in the Old Testament, and in the third century this city became the home of the Christian arts of interpretation. Indeed, this Alexandrine philosophy, in combination with the Christianity of the fourth Gospel, produced a formal system of New Testament interpretation which was equally ingenious and arbitrary. This system handed over the natural meaning of the words to the simple, sought a “moral” interpretation for the more advanced, and promised the “discerning” the discovery of a “mystic” meaning altogether different from that of the letter (“*allegory*”). The power of this method of interpretation lay partly in the abundant provision which it made for the varied requirements of edification, partly in its infinite flexibility, which made it possible not only for the third century, but for others also, to find room for their ideas within those of the first and second. Placing itself now at the service of Alexandrine theology or philosophy, now at the service of the ecclesiastical belief of that intermediate period to which it belongs, this method of interpretation always enriched the Scriptures to such a degree by the introduction of its own modes of thought, that it actually to some extent withdrew the Bible itself from the Church.

2. *The dogmatic* method of interpreting the New Testament is essentially only one of the various allegorical methods. The

expression of Christian doctrine which is publicly recognized at such and such time and in such and such a place, is taken as the rule by which to test the correctness of the interpretation. This method is the surest support of the essential elements of every Christian confession and sect. Since the seventeenth century it has been more especially the common property of the Catholic and a certain portion of the Protestant Church. Only in the former the superiority of ecclesiastical doctrinal tradition to the sacred writings is acknowledged as a principle; in the latter it is maintained that the two agree with one another.

3. *The rationalistic* interpretation of the New Testament writings is a daughter of the eighteenth century, a sister of sound common sense. With a view partly to defending and partly to regaining for the history of Jesus and the apostles its "citizenship in the natural order of things," it aimed at finding natural solutions and explanations of the miraculous events in the New Testament narrative. It must be confessed that it often simply "substituted the marvellous for the miraculous."

4. *The literal historical* method of interpretation is the only one that has any proper place in the Protestant Church. Some attempts at it were made, indeed, long before the time of Protestantism. In the fourth century, the conscience of the first theologians of Antioch heard its loud demands for admission; the greatest pulpit orator of the age submitted his preaching to its rude discipline, and yet his hearers found that he spoke "golden" words. But in the West it scarcely found any support except among the heretics with whom St. Augustine contended; and in the East it was to all intents and purposes absolutely silenced by the spirit of the age. In the later middle ages it had here and there a few supporters. In these, Luther recognized the forerunners of his purposes. But he himself always found the Scripture too serviceable for the purpose of his reform of faith, to follow logically and uniformly in the track of these forerunners. Dogmatism and rationalism distorted the language of the Bible in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries for their own

purposes. It was only *when the tyranny of rationalism itself was overthrown*, when piety was experienced and recognized as a matter of feeling, and therefore comprehended as a great and independent reality—*independent*, that is, of the changing ideas of the centuries,—it was only then that the true historical sense could be aroused, which strove to do justice not only to the later stages of the development of Christianity, but also to primitive Christian life, by its disinterested inquiry and representation. The first aim of this literal historical method is to give the exact meaning of the language of the sacred writers. The second is to estimate conscientiously the amount of credence to be given to them, on the basis of external and internal evidence from contemporary ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical literature. By these means alone does it seek to obtain a picture of the life of primitive Christianity, without in any instance toning down its supernatural colouring.

Moreover, it leaves to the sacred writers all the belief in the miraculous which belonged to their age, and the magic circle of ideas which tinge with varied hues the nature and course of their love to Jesus Christ, and to his God and their God. Its own business is simply to obtain from the available sources a faithful representation of the history of this devotion, and to explain it as clearly as possible in the light of connected contemporary history, and according to those rules of historical investigation which are recognized as valid elsewhere.

Historical inquiry refuses to recognize, even in the most extraordinary eras of humanity, any breach of the natural laws, seeing only the highest tension, within the natural order, of the powers which God has given to man. And so the historical account of Christianity, if it is to be really historical, can never acknowledge any breach in the divine order of the universe. And this principle compels it to recognize the miracles of Jesus just so far as they can be explained by the extreme mental and spiritual tension of that powerful personal influence in which Jesus so far surpassed all around him (see note on Matt. iv. 28). Further, historical

inquiry, in dealing with the documents of any age or nation, must take account of the legendary factor, especially when the documents themselves treat of religion. And the interpretation of the primitive Christian documents must not assume that it is relieved from the necessity of such precaution, especially as a very great number of the miraculous narratives of the New Testament betray their own origin by their concluding reference to Old Testament prophecy ("This was done in order that it might be fulfilled," &c.). On the other hand, in regard to *details*, it confesses its inability always to separate clearly and with certainty the actual history from the pious legends which have clustered around it, or always to point out the exact limit at which the miracles narrated of Jesus cease to be possible. Finally, the value of this method to Christian piety is this: it enables any kind of love to Jesus which seeks after salvation to complete the labour in the New Testament documents, which makes the Bible still remain for the present and future generations in itself edifying and life-giving, even without any edifying interpretation. And this it does by separating the primitive Christian circle of ideas, which no Christian any longer accepts in its entirety, from the religious substance of the gospel, which unites all Christians as followers of Christ.

---

#### IV.—THE COLLECTION OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCUMENTS.

In the Western Church the canonical collection of Christian writings was closed in the fifth century. The first collections were made under the guiding influence of the two opposing parties of primitive Christianity. The Gnostic *Marcion*, who flourished about the middle of the first century, collected in the interests of Paulinism ten Epistles of Paul and a Gospel narrative which he compiled from the Gospel according to St. Luke, at the same time increasing its Pauline tendency, and which he called simply

“Gospel.” On the other hand, the collection of *Justin*, who writes between 147 and 160 A.D., contained, in addition to the Gospel according to St. Luke, the two primitive apostolic Gospels of Matthew and Mark, and perhaps also the Johannine Gospel: the Epistles of Paul are excluded. The collectors of the two following centuries were not such decided partizans. The value which they assigned to the individual writings was mainly settled according to the greater or less amount of ancient and venerable Christian testimony which they contained. Still, even in the most important decisions of the fourth century, there is a great want of logic and consistency. In the West, the collection was finally closed in the Church by a “decree” of the Roman bishop Gelasius I. This decree, the authenticity of which has been doubted, though without sufficient reason, was issued about the year 495 A.D., and included in the collection all the New Testament writings which are found in the Bible of the present day. The order was somewhat different from ours. In many manuscripts, too, the Epistle to the Hebrews is wanting. To this decree was appended a special list of the early Christian writings which were excluded from the canon of ecclesiastical authority.

# THE GOSPELS.

---

## 1. NAME.

IN the language of the Bible itself, the word Gospel<sup>1</sup> never denotes a written work. It originally signified good message, joyful tidings (see, for example, 2 Sam. xviii. 20). Its use in the New Testament is based, in the first instance, upon the passage in Isaiah (lxii. 1), which Jesus himself adopted as the happy expression of the substance and aim of his public ministry (Luke iv. 18). And so the word Gospel soon forms the standing title, which indicates very expressively the new subject-matter which is to be offered to the world, and spread into all countries. “Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of,” says Jesus of the woman at Bethany (Mark xiv. 9). In this expression we find the beginning of the change of meaning. The Gospel is no longer simply the substance of the preaching of the kingdom itself, but the account of the Messiah and his career. The apostle Paul also frequently uses the word Gospel in the sense, not of the substance of his preaching, but of the treatment of the message (e.g. 2 Cor. viii. 18). Finally, the Epistle to the Ephesians speaks of Evangelists (Eph. iv. 11; cf. also 2 Tim. iv. 5); and upon this and the mention of Philip “the Evangelist” (Acts xxi. 8) rests the supposition that in the apostolic communities there were certain men who had a special gift and calling for the oral presentation of the facts of primitive Christianity, and

<sup>1</sup> In German *Evangelium*, derived through the Latin from the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*, which is the word used in the New Test. and in the Greek version of the passages referred to in 2 Sam. and Isaiah.—*Trans.*

who formed the personal links in the chain of evidence concerning Christ. From this it is only a step to the later use of the word which we find in the Church from the time of Justin Martyr (see p. 32). Marcion's Gospel (see p. 31) made no mention of its author, but towards the end of the second century—according to the testimony of Chrysostom, one of the Fathers—the four names were prefixed to the four Gospels by which we still distinguish them, and which are usually taken to indicate their authorship.

The original form, however, is not, for example, “Gospel of Matthew,” but “Gospel according to Matthew;” and this might mean some other writer's redaction of Matthew's account. In the same manner, when the ancient Christians spoke of a “Gospel according to Peter,” we can scarcely suppose them to have meant that he wrote it, but only that the name indicated the tendency of the work, and was the guarantee for its contents. And so, before there was any written Gospel, Paul spoke of his “Gospel” (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25). And we might quite as well call the Gospel according to St. Luke the “Gospel according to Paul,” just as there was formerly on the other side a “Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles,” which meant a Gospel in the spirit and in accordance with the ideas of the twelve as contrasted with Paul, or a “Gospel according to the Hebrews,” which name only indicates the Jewish-Christian tradition upon which it rested.

Moreover, this method of denoting the four canonical writings seems to be the result of the opinion that there is properly only one Gospel, and that the varieties of form are due simply to the various channels of tradition. The name in common use is an abbreviated expression, and the full title would be, Gospel of Jesus Christ (Mark i. 1). In fact, Irenæus, one of the Fathers who read the titles as we have them, regarded the four channels as a special provision made by the Holy Spirit against error; and he thus confirms our view of the unity of the subject and variety of channels. It is in this connection that he introduces the well-known comparison with the cherub, which, according to

Ezekiel (i. 10), is a single being, and yet displays four forms, the angel (Matthew), lion (Mark), bull (Luke), and eagle (John).

## 2. ORIGIN.

The Gospels belong, comparatively speaking, to the later portion of the New-Testament writings. It is only by the oral tradition on which they rest that the historical narratives of the New Testament are connected with the earliest period of Christianity. Jesus himself wrote nothing, but, to use the happy phrase of the fourth Gospel, he “called aloud to the world” what he had heard from the Father (John viii. 26). His audience was always, at least in spirit, and ultimately in point of fact also, the whole people, and indeed the whole human race. The eternal youth of his word has been chiefly manifested by the very fact that for a century it passed through the world of human thought preserved only by oral tradition, yet notwithstanding even in this form everything that tended to weaken or destroy its essence, and still maintaining its freshness and originality.

First of all, striking aphoristic expressions, parables and prophecies, were handed down from mouth to mouth. Thus an oral tradition was formed. And once formed, it assumed a more and more uniform character, and the expressions became to a certain extent fixed. This method of preserving the Gospel history for some time prevailed universally; and it still continued to exist, side by side with the written narratives, till towards the middle of the second century. The Gospels, even when they had already been in existence for a considerable time, had no official authority whatsoever. A certain Papias wrote his “Commentary on the Sayings of the Lord” from the oral tradition of the disciples of the apostles, although he was acquainted with the written remains of Matthew and Mark. In the writings of the apostolic Fathers, which are historically in immediate connection with the New Testament, our Gospels are scarcely mentioned. Only by slow degrees was public opinion compelled by their intrinsic value to

acknowledge their authority. Nothing is more certain than that the written narrative was not treated in the earliest period with the care which we should have expected, if there had actually been in its compilation a primary intention of establishing a documentary account confirmed by eye-witnesses, still less with the care that would have been devoted to the creation of a sacred and infallible letter of Scripture.

A new generation was required to awaken any interest in literary attempts in this direction. Jesus himself had made no provision for anything of his being written, or for anything being written about him. His immediate disciples were altogether unaccustomed to any kind of literary labour, and nothing was further than questions of literature and scholarship from the thoughts of the first Christian communities, which looked from dawn to dawn for the return of the Messiah and the end of the whole present course of the world. Even Paul, the earliest writer of Christendom, only wrote when he was compelled to do so, because it was not possible to have oral communication with the communities he addressed. In his writings he certainly reminds us here and there of important sayings of Jesus (1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 10, xi. 25), but with the exception of the account of the Last Supper, which he introduces incidentally, he only presents us with the dark picture of the death on the cross, and the bright dawn of the resurrection, in which is comprehended for him the whole import of his preaching of the historical Jesus. And even these things he refers to, not as matters of historical interest, but because they are essential to faith. Only by degrees was the religious interest followed by the historical. Going back from the death of Jesus, living memory supplied first the history of the passion, then the thread of the history was followed back through the Galilean ministry to its beginning at the baptism, and afterwards, indeed, still further back to the birth of Jesus. Separate sketches were collected together in groups, and gradually united into a finished history of the life and death of Jesus, full, and in the main complete in itself. And thus was formed a Gospel History.

## 3. HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS.

The result which we have described could only be reached when the apostles and immediate disciples of Jesus had one by one trodden the path of death, and none was left who of his own knowledge could teach concerning “all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us” (Acts i. 21). Then the transition began from the wavering oral tradition to the written, and in this process the legendary element which breathed here and there in the tradition was increased, more or less consciously according to the extent of the additions, by the imagination of the writers. These writers desired first of all to edify and instruct; and in some cases, as for example in the narrative of the Temptation, it is difficult indeed to decide how much is intended to be historical, and how much, on the other hand, is didactic. Nothing in the Bible is more characteristic of the spirit of the East than this tendency, which prevails throughout, to transform simple narrative into the symbol and channel of higher religious and moral truth. One circumstance especially must here be carefully noticed, which could not but have a most enduring effect. To the influence of the Old-Testament idea of the Messiah, by which they were involuntarily affected (especially of such passages as Is. xxix. 18 sq., xxxv. 5 sq., xlvi. 7), was added in time the deliberate imitation of the Old-Testament historical books which were always present before the eyes of our Evangelists as the models for their own literary compositions. The writers stood within the circle of Jewish life, and consequently lived and moved in those images and narratives; and, in addition to this, their own Messianic belief imperiously demanded that in the Messiah should be fulfilled and surpassed all that the Old Testament could narrate of its greatest men of God, especially of Moses and Elias. Jesus himself had made the Old Testament the basis of his whole history. Oral tradition, and then later the authors of the written accounts, only pursued the same lines still

further. And so it is often difficult to recognize the dividing line between history and legendary imitations of the Old Testament which have moulded the speech and career of Jesus. In each special case we shall always call the reader's attention to the effect of such Old-Testament influence and types.

The transition of the oral account into a written one may be explained by two causes. On the one hand, the increasing uncertainty of the oral tradition aroused a feeling of the necessity of securing what had so far been preserved. Luke (i. 4) expressly states the historical purpose of his writing. But a purely and exclusively historical interest does not exist in early Christianity. There is always connected with it the practical question of faith, and of the special school of faith. And indeed in the time of the earliest apostolic preaching this has far more weight than the historical interest. The idea of Christ himself was different in the different schools, and to each school it seemed natural and expedient to make a suitable selection from the material which was available, and sometimes even to make substantial additions and alterations. We know of the existence of the "apocryphal" and "heretical" Gospels, as they are called, such as the Gospel of the Hebrews (Jewish Christians), of the Egyptians, and of many Gnostic schools; but only a few fragments of these now remain.

But in our "canonical" Gospels, as they are called, the same religious interest of faith prevails; the most important historical questions are only incidentally touched upon. History is here written, not as Herodotus wrote, but "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name" (John xx. 31).

One purpose, then, sways these writings from first to last, sometimes more generally, sometimes more especially and definitely. The recognition of this fact will enable us to answer the question how it is that from a literature which gradually became so rich, only our present five historical books were received into the New-Testament collection. They are not the only ones, nor the

oldest, known to the ancient Church. Before Luke, "many had taken it in hand" (Luke i. 1), and our present Gospels are all based upon earlier writings. Even of the "Apocrypha" which we have mentioned, there are some which are not very inferior in age to our Gospels. But since the end of the second century these have all been excluded. The reason is, that their party aims appeared to carry them beyond the limits which Christian thought allows. In addition to this, there was the relation, which we have described, to the historical books of the Old Testament; all these bear a religious rather than a historical stamp, and the same marvellous thread runs through the historical representations of the New Testament. The writers adopt the narrative form of the Old Testament. Matthew is connected with it by the actual facts of his narrative; Luke by its form at least, and by the colouring of his language. In the former we find the relation of prophecy and fulfilment fully worked out; in the latter we find Paulinism. That is to say, there is in each a distinct selection and colouring of historical material which in itself had no connection with either of these later opposing tendencies. Only in comparatively rare cases does this interest of a special school and conception extend to a complete reconstruction of the old narrative and the free play of the imaginative and inventive powers.

#### 4. THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS.

In regard to the last point we have mentioned, there is a marked and important difference between the fourth Gospel and the first three. The first three represent in every particular an earlier stage, and adhere more closely to the popular tradition. The fourth Gospel follows a distinct line of its own, and has a style of its own altogether different from that of the first three, the existence of which it assumes. The first three, on the other hand, must be read together as three kindred accounts with an unmistakable resemblance to one another. The thread of the narrative is the same in all three, and the three accounts can be

placed in sections side by side, and brought into one common view. In all three accounts the arrangement of material—the frame, so to speak, of the picture—is the same. In many cases, moreover, they agree in a remarkable manner—in style, order of words, peculiarities of expression, and even rare forms. Hence the possibility, we may say the necessity, of bringing them together under one view, and hence also the name (*Synoptics*) by which scholars usually call them. Nor is it possible to suppose that this resemblance is merely accidental, since Jesus and the apostles spoke Aramaic, and the oldest tradition was in the same language; while the Gospels were all written in Greek, and none of them appears to be a translation. In each of these three accounts, the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus is connected in the same manner with the preaching of John the Baptist. The narrative then first carries us into Galilee, marking off certain periods of the ministry there; for example, the earlier undisturbed teaching by the Sea of Galilee, and the later retirement of Jesus from time to time, which we notice after the feeding of the multitude in the wilderness. The most important epoch of all, however, is marked by the acknowledgment of the Messiahship of Jesus by his disciples. In Cæsarea Philippi, where this takes place, Jesus has reached the most northern point to which his labours extended. From Cæsarea Philippi he journeys southwards to meet the appointed end of his labours in Jerusalem, which he now visits as the Messiah for the first time and the last. The few days which he passes in the capital are sufficient to bring about a fatal conflict with the ruling powers. And not only is the general outline the same in the first three Gospels, and different throughout from that of the fourth. They further agree in giving us, not one unbroken history, but a succession of separate short narratives, which are brought into connection with one another by special introductory and concluding phrases. This kind of narrative has been well compared to a succession of pictures in which a painter represents a complete history. And these pictures are

not always laid before us by the three Evangelists in the same order. Each one, moreover, has made his own selection. We may, however, distinguish about sixty such sections, which appear in all three with little variation, and are often verbally identical. Forty appear in Matthew and Luke, and twenty Mark has in common severally with Matthew and with Luke.

Striking as this agreement is, both in the general outline of the whole and in the form of separate narratives, new difficulties are presented by the circumstance that often, in the same passage from which we are led to infer that the Gospels have mutually influenced one another, remarkable differences occur, which indeed frequently amount to actual contradictions. And these variations which appear in the accounts are not confined to the order of the narratives, but affect to quite as great an extent the selection of material also, and peculiarities of representation. Not seldom the three begin as if they were going to give the same account of one and the same event, and they agree in whole sentences of considerable length, connected with one another in the same order; then suddenly they depart from one another, and mutually oppose one another in most important points, only to return again to friendly agreement and even verbal coincidence.

This remarkable agreement of the three first Gospels on the one hand, and their no less startling variations on the other hand, demand some explanation, and for a century scholars have been busily occupied in preparing one key after another to this puzzle. It is now generally agreed that our third Evangelist, at any rate, is the latest, as is clear from his own opening words, and that he collected together the richest material available. The precedence of the first or second, however, is still a matter of dispute. In any case, these Evangelists had somehow a common foundation, and to this they added new material, each one acting with literary freedom. The reader will find the references to parallel passages given in the notes as follows: in Mark, the references to the two other Gospels, in Matthew and Luke to Mark, and in Luke to Matthew as well as Mark.

### 5. MATTHEW.

Matthew (a Hebrew name, the same as Amittai, Jonah i. 1, = German, Treumann [Eng. Trueman]) appears in all the lists of the apostles as the name of one of the twelve disciples, who in Matt. ix. 9 is identified with Levi, who, according to Mark ii. 14 and Luke v. 27, was the fifth in order of calling. Similarly, Peter had previously been called Simon. As Matthew otherwise remains altogether in the background of the history of the apostolic age, there is the more reason to suppose that the early Church must have had some practical ground for assigning the first Gospel to him. And though the later tradition about him is of little or no value, the information of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who died about the year 165 A.D., is of considerable importance. He states that Matthew "put together the sayings" in the Hebrew, i.e. Aramaic, language; and as Papias himself, in his "Commentary on the Sayings," deals with the discourses of Jesus, he probably here refers to a collection of his utterances. Now our present "Gospel according to Matthew" must have been originally written in Greek, as is shown by an occasional play of words, and, moreover, it treats of the acts of Jesus as well as his discourses, so that it can scarcely be this that he means. At the same time, it is precisely in the abundance of its reports of the words of Jesus that it departs from the historical lines common to it and Mark. Hence we may reasonably suppose that the ancient Aramaic work to which Papias refers, the only written legacy of one of the twelve apostles, has been incorporated in our far more comprehensive Gospel according to Matthew, and given to it its title. The original writing, being in a language not generally understood, would afterwards be all the more liable to be lost. In many other respects, also, the work we are considering gives an impression of great antiquity, and only a few indications, such as the burning of Jerusalem (xxii. 7), the delay of the return (xxiv. 48, xxv. 5), the three-fold baptismal formula, which is not

found again until the time of Justin (xxviii. 19 ; compare, on the other hand, the simpler form, Rom. vi. 3 ; Gal. iii. 27; Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, x. 48, xix. 5), could make us object to the wide-spread opinion that it was written before the fall of Jerusalem. In fact, the existence of the “city of the Great King” (v. 35), with all the magnificence of the temple (xxiii. 16, 17, 21), with sacrifice (v. 23) and altar (xv. 5, xxiii. 18—20), is implied ; as also of the priests (viii. 24) and the religious parties (xxii. 23, xxiii. 2, 13 sq.). And the very discourse which deals with the future (xxiv. 4—36) is, as we shall see, unaffected by the great event of the year 70 (the destruction of Jerusalem) ; there is here no prophecy of any destruction of the city, but only of a desecration (xxiv. 15) and destruction (xxiv. 2) of the temple, and then “immediately” (xxiv. 29) the end of the world.

With this comparatively early date of composition agrees also the fact that this Gospel is intended in the first place for Jewish-Christian circles in Palestine. We see that the Christian community has not broken through the national and religious unity of Judaism, but still remains closely connected with it both inwardly and outwardly, and itself bears distinctly the stamp of the Old-Testament theocracy. And so our Gospel is distinguished from the two others in recording and emphasizing those words of Jesus which show that he confined himself and his operations strictly to Palestine, and within the bounds of Judaism, with its laws and customs (v 17, 19, vii. 6, x. 5, 6, 23, xv. 24, xxiii. 3, xxiv. 20). And though it is by no means without a corresponding counterpoise of words and deeds that point to the salvation of the whole world, yet in such passages it almost always coincides exactly with one of the others. Only the passages, ii. 11, xxi. 43, xxv. 31—46, xxvii. 24, 25, xxviii. 19, and, it may be, xx. 1—16, xxi. 28—30, have utterances of this kind, which appear to be the special property of the first Gospel. The rejection of the great bulk of the ancient people of the Covenant, and the consequent admission of the heathen into the kingdom of God, are assumed as matters of experience ; but the abolition of

the law, which led historically to this result, is condemned plainly enough in the person of the apostle Paul (v. 19). We see throughout an advanced form of Jewish Christianity, which recognizes universal religion, but which must be protected and confirmed in the consciousness of its own right, especially against Judaism itself. Hence no other Gospel presents so many quotations from the Old Testament, adduced to prove the presence of the signs of the Messiah in the life of Jesus; and no other introduces into his life so many traits drawn from the prophets.

At the same time we have in our first Gospel a compilation, the author of which has industriously collected his historical material from the sources which were available to him, and moulded it and rounded it off with an artistic completeness such as we find nowhere else except in the fourth Gospel. No other of the first three adheres so strictly to a regular arrangement of events, or carries out in so orderly a manner its grouping of material in regular cycles. We find ten miracles, seven petitions, seven woes, seven parables, three struggles in the wilderness and in Gethsemane, twice seven members in each of three groups in the genealogy. This peculiarity is rendered especially clear by the manner in which the connection is broken in five places by the insertion of long discourses, at the close of which the Evangelist regularly takes up the thread again with the words, "And it came to pass when Jesus had ended this discourse" (vii. 28, xi. 1, xiii. 53, xix. 1, xxvi. 1). The first of these long compilations (v. 3—vii. 27) is called the "Sermon on the Mount," and is placed first as a sample of the discourses of Jesus. It is followed by a decade of miracles, so selected that there is one example of each class of the miracles to be narrated of Jesus (viii. 1—ix. 34). On the other hand, our Evangelist occasionally avoids the necessity of two narratives of similar events by a peculiar method of condensation: he omits one narrative, and doubles the persons in the other. Thus he omits the healing of the demoniac in Mark i. 21—28 = Luke iv. 31—37, and afterwards introduces him in the company of the Gadarene. There, instead of one, as in Mark

v. 1—20 = Luke viii. 26—39, our Evangelist, viii. 28—34, introduces two demoniacs, to whom he attributes the words, viii. 29, which we find in Mark i. 24 = Luke iv. 34. The case is the same with the two blind men of Jericho, xx. 29—34, in place of Bartimæus, Mark x. 46—52 = Luke xviii. 35—43, after the omission of the blind man of Bethsaida, Mark viii. 22—26. These two blind men appear, for the reason we have mentioned above, as early as Matt. ix. 27—31, the first Evangelist being frequently compelled, in the interest of his own arrangement of material, to disturb and break through the chronological order of events.

## 6. MARK.

The same Papias, whom we have already mentioned several times, further states that Mark, who accompanied Peter as his interpreter, carefully wrote down all that he could remember that related to the Gospel history, from the didactic addresses of his Master. This seemed to him to afford an easy explanation of the circumstance that the order of the narrative in these two Gospels does not agree. For Peter naturally did not give a connected history of the life of Jesus, but only narrated fragments here and there, and these Mark arranged as seemed to him best. It is evident from this remark of Papias, and is, moreover, well established on other grounds, that the "Gospel according to Matthew" early took precedence of all others, so that the ecclesiastical writers formed their conception of the order of the Gospel narrative from it, and adjusted their ideas of that order by it. This account, however, so far as it connects Mark with Peter, is unassailable, for the apostle was an intimate friend at the house of Mark's mother (Acts xii. 12). Mark seems to have been born in Jerusalem, and to have been first cousin to Barnabas, who owned some property there (Acts iv. 36, 37; Col. iv. 10). It was through Barnabas that he became for a time the companion of Paul on his travels (Acts xii. 35, xiii. 5, xv. 37—39). It was probably subsequently to this that he became a disciple of Peter,

and thus obtained the title, which uniformly adheres to him in Christian tradition, of “interpreter” of this apostle, and the name of “son” in 1 Peter v. 13. Afterwards we meet with him in Rome, reconciled again with Paul (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11). When ecclesiastical tradition had once assigned the termination of Peter’s life to Rome, it was only a natural step to suppose that the Gospel named after Mark was likewise written in Rome, very possibly under the eyes of Peter. And the Fathers agree more and more uniformly in representing this as actually the case.

In point of fact, there is no reason why we should not suppose that this Gospel was composed “according to Mark,” in precisely the same manner as the first was written “according to Matthew.” In such passages as v. 37, 40—43, viii. 29—33, ix. 5, 6, x. 28, xiv. 13, 29—31, 66—72, the historical narrative may naturally be supposed to be derived from information given by Peter; in xi. 21, xiii. 3, xvi. 7, the name of this apostle is specially brought to the front; and in i. 36 the company of disciples is spoken of as “Simon and they that were with him.” The names Simon and Peter are carefully distinguished, and it is in mentioning this very change of name (iii. 16) that Justin expressly refers to certain “Memorials of Peter” as his authority. The apostle’s confession of Christ, too, only appears in its full meaning, as a kind of first fruits, in this Gospel (viii. 29); while Matt. xvi. 16 has no special force after xiv. 33. The mists of mythological narrative divide for the first time in the calling of Peter (i. 16 sq.) and the healing of his mother-in-law (i. 30 sq.). From this time the house of Peter is the starting-point for the movements and journeys of Jesus which are described in the course of the Gospel, and indeed for the whole of the Galilean ministry.

At the present day, a considerable number of students maintain that they find the Galilean ministry described in the second Gospel with, comparatively speaking, the greatest historical faithfulness and natural sequence of the individual connecting links of the narrative. And they proceed to treat this Gospel

as the common basis of the first and third. And, in fact, with the exception of about thirty verses which are lost in the general arrangement, the whole of the substance of this book written “according to Mark” may be found in the other two. It frequently happens, indeed, that first one and then the other departs from the order found in Mark, with which on the whole they agree. But the reason of this is found in the circumstances explained in the case of Luke in the notes on iv. 16—30, and in the case of Matthew on pp. 43 sq. In Mark we have, as it were, a wood, in which stand a number of different trees in natural disorder. The arrangement which we find in Matthew is like that of a nursery-garden, where the same plants stand in orderly rows carefully planned and measured out.

And, finally, tradition may not have been wrong in assigning the composition of the second Gospel to Rome, as it has done ever since about the year 200 A.D. Many Latin expressions, and not a few minor characteristics in which this Gospel departs from the common lines, are easily explained on this assumption; and the additions made by the writer to the text which is common to the three, are all made with a view to the universal religion, in opposition to Judaism (ii. 27, xii. 33, xiii. 10). The customs of the latter are here explained (vii. 3, 4), and those of heathenism expressly taken into consideration (x. 12). Soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, the centre of Christian development was transferred to Rome; and, in spite of its other signs of high antiquity, our Gospel seems to be posterior to that event, for in xiii. 24 we read more vaguely that the present age of the world will terminate “in those days, after that tribulation” (i.e. the great famine in Palestine), not, as in Matt. xxiv. 29, “immediately;” and again, in ix. 1, that certain contemporaries of Jesus shall not die “until they see the kingdom of God come with power,” not, as in Matt. xvi. 28, “until they see the Son of Man come in his kingdom.” Thus the writer already sees further into the future, and from the position which he occupies he looks beyond the mountains, behind which the first Evangelist saw the sunset

glow, and sees new hills and vales, which spread far and wide before him.

#### 7. LUKE.

In ecclesiastical antiquities, the name Lucas (Luke), contracted from Lucanus, denotes the original author of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. It was through the careful investigation of the latter work that it was first perceived that the composer of both works in their present form only wrote, like the others whom we have mentioned, “according to Luke,” and especially according to the journal of his travels, which is partially incorporated in the Acts of the Apostles. According to this account, Luke joined Paul in Troas on his second missionary journey (Acts xvi. 16), and accompanied him to Philippi (xvi. 12 sqq.), where he again attached himself to him on his return from his third missionary journey (xx. 4), in order to travel with him to Cæsarea (xxi. 7, 8) and Jerusalem (xxi. 15). As he again sets out from Cæsarea with Paul two years afterwards (xxvii. 1, 2), it would seem that he spent a considerable time in Palestine; and as Philip the Evangelist resided permanently at Cæsarea (Acts viii. 40, xxi. 8), Luke was in a position to collect historical traditions from him and others, so that many things peculiar to the third Gospel may easily have been really preserved from information received from him. Having come with the apostle Paul, now a prisoner, to Rome (Acts xxviii. 16), he continues to appear in his presence (Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11), and is honourably designated by the apostle himself as “the beloved physician” (Col. iv. 14). At the same time (Col. iv. 11) we also learn that he was a Gentile by birth, as was also probably the writer of the two books dedicated (Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1) to a certain Theophilus, otherwise unknown to us. These books must have been written at a time when Luke, who probably with Paul fell a victim to the Neronian persecution in 64, was no longer living. The complete destruction of Jerusalem is before the eyes of our Evangelist; and in Josephus’ History of the Jewish War, written about the year 75, may be

read a full description of the long and ingenious siege, the entrenchments, the famine, the massacre, the captivity of the people, and the razing of the city and the temple, which are alluded to in Luke xix. 43, 44, xxi. 20, 24. In this Gospel we find an indefinitely long period, “when Jerusalem is trodden down of the Gentiles” (xxi. 24), intervening between the fall of Jerusalem and the return of the Messiah, which is postponed to the distant future (xix. 11, 12, xxi. 12). And the literary activity of the latest of the three Evangelists falls in these “times of the Gentiles,” at the earliest towards the end of the first century of our era. He speaks of himself, indeed, as the successor of “many,” and as an inquirer and collector (i. 1—3). In the latter capacity he has not refused to accept a whole series of sayings, which are more in consonance with a one-sided Jewish Christianity than with that of Paul, inasmuch as they recommend the practice of formal piety, teach the eternal significance of the law, and condemn riches and approve of poverty in and by themselves without any reservation. The story of the Infancy has also a Jewish colouring. The third Evangelist, like the first, begins with such a narrative in order to give his readers “all things from the beginning” (i. 3). He then gives an account of the Galilean ministry (iii. 1—ix. 50), which for the most part harmonizes with that of the second Gospel. But before proceeding to the departure for Jerusalem, he inserts, in the form of a narrative of the journey (ix. 51, xiii. 22, xvii. 11), a section compiled from the Collection of Sayings and other sources. This passage is the “greater insertion” (ix. 51—viii. 14); there is a “shorter” earlier in the book (vii. 11—viii. 3).

Although it rests thus in many parts on earlier written accounts, the Gospel according to Luke preserves on the whole the independence of its conception of Christianity, especially as regards the relation of Old and New Testament. In Luke’s account of his journey, Jesus is represented, in contradiction to Matt. x. 5, 6, as having frequent intercourse with Samaritans, and more than once Jewish unbelief is rebuked by their susceptibility

(ix. 52 sqq., x. 30 sqq., xvii. 12 sqq.). This alone is a sign of the new key which this work strikes. More frequent or marked declarations against the exclusive right of the Jews to the kingdom of God are not to be found in any of the older Evangelists. The form of the account of the first public appearance of Jesus at Nazareth (iv. 16—30), placed deliberately at the head of the narrative, overthrows at once all Jewish hopes, and opens to the Gentiles the prospect of their acceptance in the kingdom of God which had been already promised in ii. 32. And many tolerant sayings and references to the calling of the Gentiles are scattered throughout the whole Gospel. Hence also the emphasis laid upon the free grace and mercy of God, and the prominence given to faith and justification, all in the spirit of Paul. The Church, therefore, has at any rate formed a correct estimate of the stamp and general substance of this Gospel in assigning it to a disciple of Paul. There are many things in the account of the appointment of the apostles (x. 7, 8), and of the institution of the Lord's Supper (xxii. 19, 20), which are taken directly from the Pauline Epistles. Further, Paul regards Christ as essentially "the second Adam" (Rom. v. 12 sqq.; 1 Cor. xv. 21 sq., 45 sqq.), and so here the genealogy goes back not to Abraham, the ancestor of the Jewish nation (Matt. i. 1 sq.), but to Adam, the ancestor of the whole human race (iii. 38). Finally, in complete agreement with this, the representation of Christ himself has now come under the influence of that view which culminated in the transformation of the historic Jesus into the pre-historic "Word of God," which at the appointed time had been made flesh (John i. 1 sqq., 14). Hence the omission of incidents, such as that in Mark iii. 21, which are inconsistent with the supernatural birth. Hence also the imaginative development of all miraculous narratives, and in every respect a Christ omniscient and omnipotent, who calls dead men from the coffin, converses with angels, and escapes miraculously from his enemies; a Christ who, on the cross, instead of uttering a bitter cry, commends himself to God with intercession for his enemies, who rises again in tangible bodily form, and finally ascends visibly to heaven.

## COMMENTARY.

---

### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

#### CHAPTER i.

The two first chapters of Matthew and of Luke are distinguished as the “introductory narrative.” We do not find in the two Gospels, however, the same introduction, but two distinct legends of the childhood of Jesus, which are altogether different from one another, and incapable of being reconciled (comp. note on ii. 7)—wreaths which the warm love, overflowing gratitude and reverent devotion of Christendom have twined around the cradle of its Lord. The contemporaries of Jesus, so far as they appear in the Gospels, know nothing of any mystery connected with his birth. Especially the inhabitants of Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 54—57), and Mary herself (Mark iii. 21, 31), have no such idea. Even Paul takes his stand on Gal. iv. 4. Jesus himself, when contending with enemies who blaspheme against him, relies not upon any miraculous entry into the world, but upon the Spirit of God, which makes the greatness of his deeds and their results (Matt. xii. 8). Compare the note on Mark i. 1.

Verse 1. *Book of the generation.* In the Greek translation of the Old Testament this expression signifies “Book of the Family,” “Family Register,” and accordingly only refers here to vv. 2—17.—*Jesus*: Jesua (for which the Greek translation of the Old Testament gives Jesus) was the later form of the ancient Hebrew name Joshua, and was then as common as our most familiar Christian names.—*Christ*: This word is the Greek translation of Maschiach (in Aramaic, Messias). This was the name given by the later

Jews to the king who was promised in the sacred writings, especially in the prophetic books, and who was to reign in the period of the glory of the nation which they expected to come, when Israel should rule over all the heathen and impart its religion to the whole world. As Jesus of Nazareth had claimed this title for himself, he was called by his followers “Jesus the Messiah.” By degrees this official title acquired the force of a second proper name, and through the usage of the apostle Paul, especially, the double name, “Jesus Christ,” as it stands here, became universally current.—*Son of David*: This was the popular name of the Messiah (cf. xii. 23), inasmuch as it was assumed on all hands that he must be a descendant of the royal line (cf. xxii. 42). Consequently the attempt to prove that he was literally a son of David followed naturally from his Messiahship. To produce documentary evidence of such descent in favour of a poor and unknown family in Nazareth, at a time when all the genealogies except those of the priestly caste were in a state of utter confusion and uncertainty, was scarcely possible. The attempt resulted in two different and contradictory accounts (see note on Luke iii. 31), which are in fact equally arbitrary; the one we have here, the other in Luke iii. 23—38. As the object of the writer of the first Gospel is to prove that Jesus is the Messiah of the Jewish nation promised in the Old Testament (see pp. 43 sq.), he only traces the genealogy back to Abraham, to whom the promises of the Messianic blessing were first given (Rom. iv.). Compare p. 50.

**3.** *Thamar* and the women mentioned in vv. 5, 6, have come into the line of the Messianic genealogy in a more or less abnormal manner (Gen. xxxviii.; Joshua ii.; Ruth iv 18—22; 2 Sam. xi.; 1 Chron. ii. 4 sq.), and hence the author of the introductory narrative here inserts them as types of Mary.

**5.** There is nothing in the Old Testament about Rahab having been the mother of Boaz.

**8.** Really Jehoram (Joram) was the father of Ahaziah, who was the father of Jehoash, who was the father of Amaziah, who finally was the father of Uzziah (Ozias).

**11.** Really Josiah was the father of Jehoiakim, who was the father of Jeconiah or Jehoiachin.—*His brothers*: The genealogist is probably thinking of Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, who is

called a brother of Jeconiah in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, but was really his uncle (Jer. xxxvii. 1; 2 Kings xxiv. 17).

12. According to Luke iii. 27, Salathiel was the son of Neri. Our author, on the other hand, is in agreement with 1 Chron. iii. 17. In 1 Chron. iii. 19, Zerubbabel is a son of Pedaiah and nephew of Salathiel. On the other hand, in Luke iii. 27, as here, and in agreement with the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Haggai, he is his son.

13. From this point, the names do not occur in the Old Testament. On the other hand, there are other descendants of Zerubbabel mentioned in 1 Chron. iii. 19 sqq.

16. The genealogy establishes the Davidic descent of Jesus on the father's side. It must therefore have been originally intended to be understood that Joseph was the father of Jesus, which is historically accurate (Matt. xiii. 55). Hence it cannot possibly be from the hand of the same writer who immediately afterwards tells us of the conception of Jesus without a father, and tries to conceal the contradiction between this genealogy and the narrative which follows (i. 18 sqq.) by inserting the description of Joseph as "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus."

17. The love of play upon numbers (see p. 44) leads to the three-fold repetition of twice seven. This is only rendered possible by the omission of the names of four kings (vv. 8, 11). And even then we must reckon Jesus in, as the fourteenth of the third list, and count Jeconiah twice, once as the last member of the second list (11, "about the time of the Babylonian captivity"), and again as the first member of the third list (12, "after the Babylonian captivity").

### Verses 18—25.

The older form of the legend of the birth of Jesus from a virgin. The first Evangelist was the first to commit this to writing, and prefix it to the accounts which he has derived from written sources in which the father, mother, brothers and sisters of Jesus are still spoken of quite naturally and without reservation (xii. 46, xiii. 55, 56).

18. *Espoused* should be "betrothed."

19. On the one hand, Joseph was strongly inclined to the law, "just," sensitive to any offence or scandal (Deut. xxii. 13 sq.);

on the other hand, he could not find it in his heart to disgrace his wife by a written divorce (Deut. xxiv. 1) declaring the cause of the separation. He therefore selected a middle course, and intended to put her away privily, i.e. by a private agreement.

21. An imitation of Gen. xvii. 19 and Judges xiii. 5. The name Jesus signifies “the Lord helps.”

22. *Which was spoken of the Lord*: “Which the Lord spoke.”

23. From Is. vii. 14. Isaiah does not speak of a virgin, but simply of a young woman. Three ancient Greek translators rightly render the passage so, but the translation which is the oldest and best known, and is the only one used in the New Testament, certainly renders the word “virgin.”

25. The oldest manuscripts and translations have simply “until she bore a son.” The description of Jesus as the “first” seems to have been introduced here from Luke ii. 7.

## CHAPTER ii.

1. A second portion of the popular legend, which is only preserved by this Evangelist.—*Bethlehem*, between five and six miles south of Jerusalem, as being the home of the family of David, is here spoken of without hesitation as the residence of all the ancestors of Jesus. In Luke (ii. 4), we find quite a different account.—*King Herod*, called the Great in distinction from his sons, a half-bred Jew and an upstart, ruled over Palestine for nearly forty years. But his government, founded upon the ruins of the national throne, maintained by the help and exercised according to the wishes of Rome, was regarded by the Jewish nation as nothing but a foreign tyranny. He died early in April in the year 4 B.C. Hence, according to verse 16, we should have to suppose that Jesus came into the world six or seven years “before the birth of Christ.” Luke ii. 2 requires a different date.—*Wise men*: The text has “magi.” This name magian, as a term for Asiatic magicians (as in Acts viii. 9, xiii. 6, 8) or astrologers (as here), made its way into the Grecian world from Babylon, the ancient home of astrology.—*From the East*: The oldest Fathers mention Arabia, of which we are of course reminded both by the gifts (ver. 11) and the passage (Is. lx. 6, 7) on which this rests. In later legends, the “wise men” are turned

into the three kings.—*Jerusalem*: The capital of Palestine, and also the residence of the king.

2. The Jewish Messianic hope had been carried to the East by the numerous Jewish inhabitants of Babylonia. This is assumed by the legend, the origin of which must not be sought by laborious astronomical calculations, but is found in the Old Testament, in the passages which speak of a Star out of Jacob, a Sceptre out of Israel (Numb. xxiv. 17), and generally of lights arising for Israel and for the nations (Is. ix. 2, lviii. 8, lx. 1—3). Hence first the star, and then the company of magi watching it. There are many narratives which show how natural such legends of stars were to antiquity, as, for example, the account of the comet which remained in the sky for seven days after the death of Cæsar (*Suetonius*).—*To worship him*: i.e. to do homage in Eastern fashion, with the face to the ground. Similarly magi, who happened to be in Athens at the time of Plato's death, are said to have offered sacrifice to the departed spirit of the superhuman sage (*Seneca*).

3. It is the thought of a new king arising, with a legitimate claim to the throne, and answering to the national expectations, that terrifies Herod.

4. *All the chief-priests and scribes*: By this the writer means the whole high council, the highest court of the Jewish nation (in Greek, Synedrion, from which is made the Hebrew word Sanhedrin). It consisted of “the high-priest” and former high-priests, who, together with the heads of the families from which they were appointed, are called “the chief-priests” in the New Testament; secondly, the “scribes,” properly “writers,” i.e. the religious teachers; thirdly, the “elders” (not mentioned here), or rather the members selected from among the elders who presided over the several communities. From them the king demands an opinion upon the question, where the Old Testament places the birth of the Messiah. The historical Herod would have been more likely to turn his attention to quieting the Messianic expectations, and was at deadly strife with the scribes. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether any Sanhedrin existed at that time.

5. The passage in Micah v. 1 (cf. also John vii. 42) gave rise to the whole of this introductory narrative. It was well known that Jesus came from Nazareth. But if he was to be the Messiah,

Bethlehem must be proved to have been his birth-place. This is one of the two points of agreement between the introductory narratives of Matthew and Luke which differ in everything else. (The other point is the conception by the Holy Spirit.) But there are two ways in which it might be shown that Jesus, although a Nazarene, was born at Bethlehem. If the parents of Jesus lived originally in Bethlehem, then the question was, what caused them to remove to Nazareth? Our narrative answers, Herod, who like another Pharaoh raged against the second deliverer and lawgiver of the people, as Pharaoh of old against Moses. But he must first have learnt from the astrologers that a child so dangerous to him was born, and where he was born. On the other hand, if the parents of Jesus lived from the first at Nazareth, then it was necessary to transfer them for a time to Bethlehem at the date of the birth of Jesus, as is done in the introductory narrative of Luke (see note on Luke i. 20).

6. The passage is quoted with great freedom. The birth-place of the Messiah must not be "small," as Micah calls Bethlehem; hence we have here, "by no means the least." The Hebrew, again, does not speak of "princes" (in which our Evangelist follows an erroneous punctuation of the Hebrew letters), but of "districts."—*Shall rule* should be "shall pasture," or "feed."

7. *Inquired of them diligently what time, &c.*, i. e. "Asked them exactly when," &c. It is impossible to say why he called them *privily*; and the whole naïve and circumstantial account of a proceeding more like that of a practised police officer than of king Herod is only intelligible as part of the legend. From the detailed account which Josephus, the Jewish historian, gives of the times of Herod, we only learn generally that the Messianic expectations of the people gave the greatest anxiety to the suspicious and persecuting king, who endeavoured to defend his crown against all Israel by fire and sword, rack and massacre.—*Inquired*: It was especially important to him to know how long the star had been seen. It appears from verse 16, that it must have been about two years, and that Jesus was born about two years before the events here related (ver. 16). Hence we cannot place this narrative before Luke ii. 22—40, especially as the child would then, contrary to all the assumptions of our present narrative (see verse 13), have been brought into the royal city, the

very centre of danger. Nor can it be inserted in the “forty days” of Luke ii. 21, 22, as so short a time leaves no room for the flight into Egypt. It is equally inconceivable that our present narrative should belong after Luke ii. 21—40; for, according to Luke ii. 38, Anna had already made known the news to all Jerusalem (contrary to ver. 3), and the magi again would have had to seek the parents of Jesus, not in Bethlehem, but in Nazareth (Luke ii. 39). Consequently the two introductory narratives exclude one another.

9. The star, which had not been seen for some time, suddenly re-appears as they set off by night towards Bethlehem, and moves on before them, until it stands at last over the goal of their journey—a physical impossibility, but an idea full of poetic power and beauty.

11. *Gold and frankincense*, from Is. lx. 6; *myrrh* (comp. note on Mark xv. 23), from Ps. xlv. 9: the greatest treasures of the East.

12. The usual machinery in the introductory narrative of the first Gospel; comp. vv. 13, 19, 20, 22.

13. We may compare various narratives of danger and deliverance, during their childhood, of men who are afterwards to become renowned in history. But we should especially notice that the story of the wonderful deliverance of the child Moses in Egypt (Exod. ii. 1—10) has had a direct influence upon the story of the flight of the child Christ into Egypt.

14. *When he arose, &c.*: “And he arose and took,” &c.

15. From Hos. xi. 1. The passage refers to the exodus of Israel from Egypt. In Exod. iv. 23, Jer. xxxi. 9, as well as in this passage, Israel, as the chosen people, is called Son of God. So the Messiah, who is personally what the whole people should be, is called “Son of God.” This is the oldest meaning of the epithet, and is the sense in which, for example, it is always to be understood in the first Gospel (iii. 17, iv. 3, 6, viii. 29, xiv. 33, xvi. 16, xvii. 5, xxvi. 63, xxvii. 40, 43, 54). It was not till Christianity came into contact with heathenism that a new element entered the conception of a “Son of God,” and the idea of Jesus being physically a Son of God became possible (see note on Luke i. 35).

16. *Coasts*: “Borders.”—In this verse it becomes still more

plain how Herod is thought of as a second Pharaoh. In both cases the child, on whose life or death all depends, is to be caught, as it were, in a great net with other children, but escapes, while the others perish. The worst of all tyrants, an enemy of God and the people alike, is represented as engaged in a vain struggle with the true king of the people and Son of God. Perhaps the writer had Rev. xii. 4 in his mind. We have no other account whatever of this horrible massacre which would surpass all that Josephus relates of the old king's suspicion and cruelty. The earliest allusion to it is in the fourth century, when a Roman writer (Macrobius) confuses the massacre of the innocents at Bethlehem with Herod's execution of his own sons, of which we have historical evidence.

**17.** Jeremiah xxxi. 15.

**18.** Rachel, the tribal-mother, was buried, according to Gen. xxxv. 19, near Bethlehem. Jeremiah, depicting the horror of the last days of the kingdom of Judah, represents Rachel as arising from her grave and weeping in Rama, which lay about as far to the north of Jerusalem as Bethlehem did to the south. Then the lamentation was over the captivity of her children who were led away to Babylon. Now it is over their cruel destruction.

**20.** Rests on Exod. iv. 19.

**21.** Similarly imitated from Exod. iv. 20.

**22.** [*Notwithstanding he turned aside*, should be, “But he went up.”]—After Herod's death, the Jewish land was divided among his sons according to his will. Archelaus, who seems to have inherited also the chief part of his father's wickedness, received the royal title, with Judea, Samaria and Idumea. Galilee and Perea fell to Herod Antipas (comp. Luke xxiii. 7), and the northern and eastern parts of the territory to Philip (comp. note on xvi. 13).

**23.** This migration to Nazareth is only required for the reason mentioned in the note on ver. 5. Nazareth was really Jesus' birth-place (see Matt. xiii. 54, 57, xxi. 11). Hence he is always called “Jesus of Nazareth,” and his followers “Nazarenes” (Acts xxiv. 5), which would not have been the case if he had been merely a settler there. Nazareth, or Nazara, is a little town, never mentioned by Josephus, hidden in the great depression of the highland which bounds the plain of Jesreel on the north. A magnificent

view is obtained from the lofty ridge (Luke iv. 29) a few hundred feet above the present rows of houses which rise in terraces one above the other. The passage quoted here from “the prophets” is not to be found in this form anywhere in the Old Testament. The word Nezer, which reminds one of Nazareth and Nazara, means “shoot” or “branch,” and is applied by Isaiah (xi. 1) to the theocratic king who is to be expected in the future, who is called a rod or branch of the stem of Jesse (comp. also Is. iv. 2). The Evangelist entirely ignores the historical meaning of the passage, and avails himself solely of the verbal similarity of the names. Possibly, however, he is also thinking of the Nazirites of the Old Testament, who are described in Luke i. 15. Comp. Judges xiii. 5 : “Lo, thou shalt conceive and bear a son. The boy shall be a Nasirite from his mother’s womb, and he shall begin,” &c. The continuation of the same passage has already been referred to (i. 21). Jerome has rendered Nasirites, “Nasarites,” and in Epiphanius, Nasarite is used as a parallel form of Nazarite. Hence we see that the confusion of the two words is quite possible.

### CHAPTER iii.

#### Verses 1—6 = Mark i. 1—6.

1. *In those days*: Imitation of the style of the Old Testament, e.g. Exod. ii. 11. There is an interval of thirty years between this and the preceding chapters.—*John*: Distinguished from other persons of the same name in the Bible by the designation “the Baptist.” He was one of those who looked earnestly and with lofty confidence to the future, and fled from the enervating whirl of society to seek release in the solemn stillness of the wilderness. Such was partly the case with the Essenes, a Jewish religious order to which John stands in somewhat the same relation as a hermit of the middle ages to the monks who lived under a common rule and discipline in a monastery. He, too, appears “in the wilderness of Judea,” i.e. the steep pastures and gorges of the limestone range on the east towards the Dead Sea where the Essenes congregated. We should further note that the Jewish historian Josephus mentions this man as an important phenomenon of the time.

2. The first Evangelist is the only one who gives the substance of the Baptist’s preaching in this shape (= iv. 17 in the mouth

of Jesus, as also in Mark i. 15). But there is no doubt that he demanded repentance, in the widest sense, moral purification and general conversion, and that he required it in preparation for the forthcoming establishment of a kingdom of God.—*The kingdom of heaven*: A favourite expression of the first Evangelist, corresponding to the expression “kingdom of God” in the others. The universal empire of the Messianic period, which was hoped for, bears the latter name because it is one of the main principles of the Old Testament that a divine monarchy is to be established upon earth, in which God himself is to rule by his representative the Messiah. The former name it bears because it is to descend upon earth from heaven, where God has prepared it beforehand, and there to take its place in opposition to the kingdom of the world, which is of infernal origin. Hence it is in any case something to be realized on this side the grave. Comp. Daniel vii. 13, 14, the passage on which Jewish doctrine concerning the kingdom and the Messiah mainly rests.

3. The Old-Testament type of the Baptist was found in Is. xl. 3. The words, “in the wilderness,” which in the original passage are used of preparing a way (a way is to be made for God, who will bring his people home from the Babylonian captivity), were referred to preaching—John preaching in the wilderness.

4. The dress of a prophet: comp. 2 Kings i. 8; Is. xx. 2; Zech. xiii. 4; Matt. vii. 15; Heb. xi. 37. The wilderness of Judea affords the scanty subsistence mentioned in the text.—*Wild honey*: comp. Judges xiv. 8; but it is more probable that this was taken from the trees.

6. Afterwards, John seems to have remained permanently on the lower Jordan, the bed of which forms the boundary of the wilderness of Judea, in order to baptize there. This outward act, consisting in complete immersion, was the symbol and visible expression (indispensable to the Eastern mind) accompanying the inner act of repentance. It was an understood thing, of which no proof was required, that this was followed by the divine “forgiveness of sins” (Mark i. 4). Thus the salvation of the future had already been announced by the prophets under the symbols of washing and cleansing (Is. i. 16, iv. 4; Micah vii. 19; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 29, 33; Zech. xiii. 1). Hence every one who submitted to the baptism of John confessed, on the one hand, that he was a sinner,

and, on the other hand, pledged himself to lead a new moral life. The Evangelists emphasize the former aspect of John's baptism, Josephus brings the latter into greater prominence.

Verses 7—10 = Luke iii. 7—9.

**7. Pharisees:** The word signifies those who separated themselves. It was used of those “separatists” who diligently impressed upon themselves the peculiar characteristics of Judaism, in distinction not only from those who were not Jews, but also from those of their compatriots who were less strict in their opinions. Hence they were the leaders of the dominant party, which was zealous for the law and exclusively national. They struck the key-note of piety. They were the authorities for the fantastic popular belief. And they themselves sought to gain a reputation by strict submission to the letter of the Old Testament, and a painful observance of the “Traditions of the Elders” (xv. 2), which had been added to it in the course of time.—**Sadducees:** These, on the other hand, took their stand solely upon the Mosaic law, to the exclusion of any respect for tradition, and from this position they attained the insipid faith described in xxii. 23. Their party included the older priestly families, was high in honour and office in Jerusalem, and contrasted with the popular and democratic party of the Pharisees in having an essentially aristocratic and respectable character.—**Wrath:** The divine judgment, which the Baptist regards as necessarily connected with the impending day of God. The popular Jewish opinion was, that judgment was to be executed upon the heathen; but the Baptist winnows the wheat from the chaff even within the chosen people (ver. 12).

**8. Fruits meet for repentance:** i.e. worthy of those who are converted.

**9.** What was new and a direct preparation for Christianity in the Baptist's appearance was, that he took up a genuine moral position, and thereby broke down the vanity of “the chosen people,” which relied upon its descent. The traditional Jewish righteousness is not acceptable to him either as the inheritance of those who are descendants of Abraham and circumcised Israelites, or as the acquisition of formal Pharisaic observances.

**10. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees:** “And already the axe is laid at the root of the trees.”

**11** = Mark i. 7, 8. *He that cometh after me*: The Messiah considered as the personal representative of God (Mal. iii. 1). A summons to repentance and warning of the impending day of God, and the final proclamation issuing from the moral consciousness of Israel itself regarding the necessity of new creative power, are the two component parts of the preaching of John.—*Whose shoes I am not worthy to bear*: Slaves carry their masters' sandals after them, or loosen them from their feet. The latter expression is used in Mark i. 7 = Luke iii. 16. In contrast to his harbinger who warns with words and absolves symbolically, he who is to come will judge with the power of the Spirit. The approved he will endow with the Holy Spirit, of which the water of baptism was but the symbol; the condemned he will consume with the fire of wrath (comp. ver. 12).

**12** = Luke iii. 17. *Fan*: “winnowing shovel.” When the husbandman on the threshing-floor tosses into the air with the winnowing shovel the corn which he has threshed out, many heavy grains fall near him, and he gathers them up with care; but there is more chaff and straw that is blown away by the wind. The straw and empty ears served for fuel.

### Verses 13—17 = Mark i. 9—11.

A tradition corresponding to the narrative of the birth of Jesus is inserted in vv. 14, 15, in answer to the question, which from the point of view of that narrative is imperative, How could the Son of God submit to be baptized and cleansed at the hands of a sinful man?

**15.** *All righteousness*: i.e. every divine ordinance. The baptism pointed out by the prophets and required by the Baptist appears as such (comp. xvii. 27).

**16.** A description of a vision of Jesus, who, ripe for the belief in his own destiny, solemnizes the hour of his decision (comp. Ezek. i. 1). Hence the oldest tradition, both within and without the New Testament, takes the baptism as the date and spring of the Messianic consciousness, when Jesus is endowed with the Spirit of God by which he is henceforth led (comp. iv. 1). The later introductory narratives carry this peculiar relation of Jesus to the Spirit of God back to the very beginning, and represent him as begotten by the Spirit. But even in the form of the

dove in which the Spirit here appears, we find traces of the artistic development of the narrative of the baptism. To the Jews and Samaritans the dove was the favourite bird of God and man, the bird of sacrifice, the messenger of peace to Noah, the type of brooding nature, and the symbol of the Holy Spirit. The Rabbis (Jewish theologians) conceived of the Spirit of God moving over the face of the waters (Gen. i. 2) in the form of a dove.

17. To the miracle of the inner vision corresponds a miracle of the inner hearing. Our Evangelist, however, transforms it from an address to Jesus himself (Mark i. 11 = Luke iii. 22) into a divine declaration of his Messiahship, removes it from the sphere of the inner consciousness of Jesus, and enlightens John as to his nature and character, which is quite unnecessary after what has preceded in verse 14. The divine utterance itself is taken from Is. xlii. 1 and Ps. ii. 7. But the recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus by John at this point becomes impossible when we consider Matt. xi. 3, and in view of the general fact that Jesus did not make himself known as the Messiah till a much later period of his life (see note on xvi. 17).

#### CHAPTER iv.

Verses 1—11 = Luke iv. 1—12.

1. *Of the Spirit:* The same divine guide which had “come upon him” (iii. 16). The temptation appears as one that was deliberately challenged. The divine power and divine sonship which had been imparted were to be proved good at once.—*Into the wilderness:* see note on iii. 1. According to xii. 43, Is. xiii. 21, the wilderness is the abode of the evil spirits, and the chief of them at once undertakes the business of temptation. According to Jewish ideas, which have their influence even as late as 1 John iii. 8, the Messiah must overcome the devil. The special expectation of the Christians was, that whereas the Messiah had been put to death by the devil on his first appearance (Luke xxii. 3; John xiii. 2, 27), he would utterly destroy him at his second coming (2 Thess. ii. 3 sqq.; Rev. xix. 19, 20, xx. 2, 10). What is then to happen as an external reality, the legend represents him as now morally accomplishing. The human life of Jesus brought with it struggles and temptations of the bitterest kind, which were all triumphantly overcome (xvi. 23, xxii. 18, xxvi. 37—42; Luke

xviii. 19, xxii. 28). But in our present narrative, which is of a mythical character throughout, they are all concentrated upon a single point, which, as in the Greek myth of The Choice of Hercules, can only mark the outset of the life to which he is called. The Old-Testament type is the people of Israel, which God tempted forty years long in the wilderness (Deut. viii. 2), in order to try its heart as a figure of the temptation to come (1 Cor. x. 6, 11). Israel, indeed, did not withstand the temptation, but the Messiah withstands it.

**2.** Old-Testament types are partly Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 28) and Elijah (1 Kings xix. 8), partly the people who murmured because of their hunger in the desert (Exod. xvi. 2 sqq.).

**3.** *The tempter*: Satan is so called after Job i. 6—12, ii. 1—7; 1 Chron. xxi. 1.—*If thou be the Son of God*: In imitation of the type of the serpent (Gen. iii. 1), he calls in question the words which God has uttered (iii. 17).

**4.** Jesus quotes Deut. viii. 3, according to which God's creative word makes all things for the sustenance of man, and has always means to assist him. The gift of miracles is not to be expended in satisfying mere material wants. On the historical place of such temptations, see notes to xiv. 21, xvi. 9, 10.

**5.** *The holy city*: so Jerusalem is called in the first Gospel (see xxvii. 53, and note on v. 35). *A pinnacle*: “the battlement.” One of those places on the edge of the temple mountain must be meant, from which one looks straight down the precipice below.

**6.** The devil also quotes Scripture (Ps. xcii. 11, 12). The temptation thus assumes the character of a theological contest similar to those between Simon Peter and Simon Magus depicted in the Clementine romance.

**7.** According to 1 Cor. x. 9 (= Exod. xvii. 1 sqq.; Numb. xxi. 4 sqq.), the Israelites tempted God in the wilderness; i.e. they challenged Him to manifest His power. Hence the quotation from Deut. vi. 16. The historical place of this refusal to make a display of miraculous powers is in xii. 39, xvi. 4.

**8.** The kingdoms of the world are regarded as the property of the devil, as is stated still more clearly in Luke iv. 6. Hence “the prince of this world,” John xii. 31. Comp. note on xvi. 13.

**9.** According to 1 Cor. x. 7 (Exod. xxxii. 6), the people were also tempted to apostacy and idolatry in the wilderness.

**10.** *Get thee hence, Satan:* The historical position of these words is xvi. 23. The quotation is from Deut. vi. 13. Renunciation of all means of obtaining power which are earthly and opposed to the divine will.

**11.** Here again Elijah, to whom, according to 1 Kings xix. 5, angels brought food in the wilderness, is the Old-Testament type. The people, too, had “angels’ food” to eat (Ps. lxxviii. 25) in the wilderness.

**12** = Mark i. 14.—*That John was cast into prison:* further particulars of this are given in xiv. 3, 4.

### Verses 13—16. Only in Matt.

**13.** The change of residence from Nazareth to Capernaum is intentionally introduced in opposition to Mark i. 14—21.—*His own city* (ix. 1), Capernaum (= Village of Nahum), was at that time a busy and flourishing town, situated on the great commercial road from Ptolemais to Damascus (“the way of the sea,” comp. Is. ix. 1), by the Sea of Gennesaret. It has now completely disappeared, and the whole neighbourhood of the lake has lost much of the beauty and charm which it then possessed.—*In the borders of Zebulon and Nephthalim:* The old tribal divisions had long been abolished. The district is thus described on account of the quotation which is to follow in verse 15.

**14.** According to John vii. 52, “out of Galilee cometh no prophet,” and the Messiah especially, according to Matt. ii. 5, must be from Judea. Hence our Evangelist endeavours to prove from Isaiah, that the land by the Sea of Galilee (i.e. the Lake of Gennesaret or Tiberias) was first to see the Messianic light.

**15.** A free rendering of Is. ix. 1 (viii. 23). The territory of the tribes Zebulon and Naphthali lay on the Jordan and by the lake.—*The way of the sea:* comp. note to verse 13.—*Beyond Jordan:* equivalent to Peræa, the land east of the Jordan, opposite to Capernaum, also the scene of the labours of Jesus.—*Galilee of the Gentiles:* The most northern part of Palestine, having a considerable Gentile population, and bordering upon heathen lands, was called “the district of the Gentiles” (Gelil-haggojim, whence the name Galilee).

**16.** From Is. ix. 2 (1). Comp. note on Luke i. 79, ii. 8.

**17** = Mark i. 14, 15. Compare note on iii. 2. Any adult

Jew might come forward in this way as a teacher. Competition in this was absolutely free.

**Verses 18—20 = Mark i. 16—20.**

The first-fruits of the disciples. A wide-spread influence requires, in the first place, a narrower circle of disciples. In this Jesus followed the example of other teachers of his time, and, above all, the example of the prophets. Old-Testament types in 1 Kings xix. 19—21. Fishing, from which Jesus calls the two brothers, and agriculture (see Luke ix. 62) were the chief occupations in that part of the country. For the Old-Testament original of “fishers of men,” see Jer. xvi. 16. On Peter, see note on Mark iii. 16.

**Verses 23—25 = Mark iii. 10—12.**

A summary of the labours of Jesus in teaching and healing, as a kind of superscription to chapters v.—vii. (an example of his teaching), and viii. ix. (examples of miracles).

**23. Healing:** The occurrence of such healings is regarded by the apostle Paul as a marvellous gift laid in the cradle of the Christian community (1 Cor. xii. 9, 29), and he was even conscious of having performed some himself (2 Cor. xii. 12). The Old Testament indicated the time of the Messiah as a period of most perfect health and universal welfare (Is. xxix. 18, 19, xlvi. 7). Jesus himself recognized in such descriptions the symbolic representation of his career; hence Is. xxxv. 5, 6 = Matt. xi. 5, and Is. xli. 1 = Luke iv. 18—21. Comp. pp. 37 sq.

**24. Those who were possessed:** Whatever these may have been, they are a part of the historical basis of the whole miraculous element of the New Testament. The “unclean spirits,” or “devils” (demons), had their home in the Persian religion; but after the Babylonian captivity they spread into Judea, and were especially active there under the Roman empire, which they were supposed to assist vigorously and effectively. All idolatry was supposed to originate with them (1 Cor. x. 20). Having their home in the dark air (Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12) and in desert places (see note on ver. 1), they have a natural impulse to attack men and make their dwellings in them, thereby destroying them with the greatest tortures (Matt. xii. 43—45). Hence possession became the popular expression for insanity. And while Satan is the cause

of every disease (Luke xiii. 16), every one whose mind is affected is especially regarded as a sacrifice to some dark power which renders him strange and unintelligible to himself and his fellow-men. Sudden dumbness and deafness too, but above all delirium, epilepsy, and all kinds of convulsions and sudden seizures, were regarded as the work of demons. This was the explanation of the peculiarly mysterious nature of such diseases. The sufferers themselves were as convinced of this possession as the beholders, and hence in the New Testament they usually speak in the name of the spirit or spirits by which they are tormented (comp. Mark iii. 11). Disease of this kind must have been especially common at that period in the East, and there were exorcists everywhere, and not least among the Jews (Matt. xii. 27; Acts xix. 13), who were the lunacy physicians of the time. It may be proved not only from Mark ix. 38, but also from Jewish sources, that the name of Jesus was regarded as an excellent means for the expulsion of devils. Hence it would seem that the public life of Jesus manifested startling results in the sphere of the healing of troubled souls, as even the contemporary Pharisees acknowledged (xii. 24).

—*Lunatic*: These occur only in the first Gospel (comp. xvii. 15). They are epileptics, whose fits were supposed to depend upon the changes of the moon.—*Those that had the palsy*: i.e. such as had lost the use of their limbs by palsy or paralysis. The words of Is. xxxv. 3, pointed to a beneficent influence on such as these: “Strengthen ye the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees!” It is a disputed question whether the healing influence of Jesus was confined to the sphere of spiritual and moral disease. At any rate, the details of cases in which he went beyond it cannot be recognized, and if he did so at all, the necessity of such a course is to be found quite as much in his overpowering compassion, accompanied by a faith capable of removing mountains, and allowing no limits to be set before it, as in the expectation of the people who insisted upon finding in religion a cure for all ills, and in the Messiah a man at least equal to Moses and the prophets if they were to believe in him; while conversely only those who believe can be helped, and Jesus’ power of working miracles fails as soon as ever this condition is withdrawn (Mark vi. 5). The Evangelists represent this power as flowing from him wherever sick persons press to him, fall down before him, touch

his garments, beseech his pity, express their faith that help can be given them, so that the Saviour's sense of power is excited and he is roused to exert it.

**25.** *Decapolis*: a confederation of ten cities, chiefly inhabited by Gentiles, and most of them situated east of the Jordan and south-east of the lake. This great concourse of people has no historical place till after the first beginnings of Jesus' work and influence were already past. Comp. note on Mark iii. 8.

## CHAPTER V.

### Verses 1, 2.

Introduction to what is commonly called the Sermon on the Mount (comp. p. 44), which brings together in this form a number of Jesus' sayings of various kinds, not a few of which re-appear in the first Gospel itself. It is given as a kind of opening address to the people and the disciples. The Mount is from Mark iii. 13. Luke (vi. 20—49) gives this collection of sayings differently.

### Verses 3—12: The Beatitudes.

Instead of the four beatitudes in Luke vi. 20—23, we find nine, or, according to the usual reckoning, seven (vv. 10—12 would then form the transition to the ordinary discourse), or eight, the double of Luke's number (in which case 11 is reckoned as a repetition of 10).

**3.** *Poor in spirit*: So we read of those who are “contrite and humble in spirit,” Is. lvii. 15; Prov. xvi. 19, xxix. 23. Having a feeling of poverty within.

**5.** *They shall inherit the earth*: This expression is very frequently used in the Old Testament of the occupation of the land of Canaan by the people of the covenant (e.g. Gen. xv. 7; Deut. iv. 1. [A.V has “possess” in the second passage, but the Heb. is the same in both.]). This promise, as denoting generally the sum of all divine blessing, is then extended to individual pious persons, e.g. Ps. xxv. 13, xxxvii. 9, 11.

### Verses 13—16.

Province of the disciples as the light and salt of the earth.

**13.** *Salted*: In order that it may in its turn gain new power of seasoning.

[15. “Neither do men light a lamp and put it under the bushel, but on the lampstand.”]

Verses 17—20.

Fundamental principle of the Christian position with regard to the law; the all-important question from the point of view of the first Evangelist.

17. *To fulfil*: not “to fill out” or “complete,” but to teach and do what the law requires, and to enjoin it upon others, until all is done and all has come to pass which ought to be done and is to come to pass.

18. *One jot*: “one yod” (י) a Hebrew letter. *One tittle* should be “one penstroke.”—If the very letter of the law, according to this passage, is to retain its authority, extending to the final fulfilment of all its provisions as long as heaven and earth exist, then certainly the discourses and proceedings narrated in Mark ii. 19—22, 27, 28, vii. 1—23, x. 2—9, xii. 28—34, do not harmonize with this, inasmuch as these passages distinguish between great and small commands, and indeed depart entirely from the legal standpoint.

19. *The least*: as in 1 Cor. xv. 9: “I am the least of the apostles” (comp. p. 43 *ad fin.*).

Verses 21—48.

Twice three examples of the true fulfilment of the law, in opposition to the Pharisaic treatment of the law.

21. Exod. xx. 13; Levit. xxiv. 17; Deut. v 17.—*By them*: “to them.”—The clause added by the scribes brings the crime to judgment in the spirit of the law.

22. A double climax. First, in the advance from the feeling of anger in the heart to an outburst in words, in which again a distinction is made between *Racha* (i.e. “thou vain fellow,” James ii. 20) and *thou fool* (i.e. according to Ps. xiv. 1, 1 Sam. xxv. 25, “thou infidel,” “godless man;” secondly, in the advance from the simple lower court in the Israelitish provincial towns to the high court at Jerusalem, which can pass sentence of death; finally, to the fire of hell, from which there is no release.—The words *without a cause* should be omitted; they are not in the oldest MSS.

23. Comp. ix. 13, xii. 27.

**25.** *Agree*: lit. “be well disposed towards, or favourable to,” i.e. inclined to satisfy him by paying the debt in question.

**26.** *Farthing*: Quadrans, or fourth part of an as, divided into two lepta or mites, which occur Mark xii. 42, Luke xii. 59.

**27.** Exod. xx. 14; Levit. xx. 10.—*By them of old time*: “to them of old time.”

**28.** Exod. xx. 17; Job xxxi. 1.

**29.** *Offend*: i.e. cause to fall, or at least entice to evil.—*Pluck it out*: A powerful figure, denoting the inexorability of war to the knife.

**31.** Deut. xxiv. 1. The scribes in the time of Jesus interpreted this provision of the law, which expressly assumes “some shameful thing” on the part of the wife, in such a manner as to leave free scope for any light conduct, so long only as the letter of divorce (see note on i. 19) was given.

**32.** *Causeth her to commit adultery*: i.e. if she marry again. The very object of the written divorce was to allow her to marry again.

**33.** Combination of Levit. xix. 12 with Numb. xxx. 3 and Deut. xxxiii. 23.—*By them*: “to them.”

### Verses 34—36.

Further explained by xxiii. 16—22. Basis of this in the Old Testament, Is. lxvi. 1. Every higher thing to which a man appeals on his oath, in order to make others trust his word, carries us back finally to God himself, whose name shall not be taken thoughtlessly.

**35.** *Of the great King*: i.e. “of God,” Ps. xlvi. 2, xciv. 4. Hence “the holy city,” Matt. iv. 5, xxvii. 53.

**37.** Plain, simple truthfulness in our intercourse with one another.

**38.** The right of retaliation (*jus talionis*) is the foundation of the Mosaic law: Exod. xxi. 24; Levit. xxiv. 50; Deut. xix. 21.

**39.** *Evil* should be “the wicked man,” i.e. any one who does you an injury.

**40.** *Coat and cloke*: something the same as tunic and toga.

**41.** *Compel thee to go*: i.e. require thee to conduct him on his journey, a right possessed by the government officials (comp. xxvii. 32). Jesus regards it as an injustice; but so far from

offering resistance to it, the Christian ought to shame those who insist on it by giving more than is required. They must not retaliate, but outdo evil with good.

**43.** Only the first half of this saying is expressed in Levit. xix. 18, and that on the assumption of course that the conception of neighbour is limited by the national frontier. The scribes therefore supplemented it by the proposition which appears to be sanctioned by the position of the Old Testament with regard to Moab, Ammon, Edom, &c., that one might, and indeed must, hate the Gentile as an enemy of God. Hence heathen writers accuse the Jews of “hatred of the human race.”

**45.** *That ye may be the children*, should be, “that ye may become sons.” Here we have the application which was given in the mind of Jesus to the idea of the divine sonship. Elsewhere the idea was limited to the Jewish Messianic sense (ii. 15), or at a later date affected by Greek notions (see note on Luke i. 35). Finally, he only finds it realized in himself (see note on xi. 27).

**46.** *Publicans*: Tax-gatherers, some of them Romans and some natives, who were either in the service of Roman farmers of taxes as sub-farmers, or else (as seems to have been the case in Palestine at that time) were appointed directly by the government. They were detested both on account of their unpatriotic occupation, and also because of the various unjust and oppressive means which they employed in order to obtain what was due to them.

## CHAPTER vi.

### Verses vi. 1—vii. 12.

The second part of the Sermon on the Mount, consisting first (1—18) of a criticism of the three favourite ways of expressing the Pharisaic piety which prevailed at the time, viz. alms, prayer, fasting.

**1.** *Alms*: The reading “Righteousness” is probably the correct one; but in what follows, this is at once especially applied to benevolence; and, moreover, in ten passages the Greek translation of the Old Testament renders the Hebrew word for “righteousness” by “alms,” and the latter is called “righteousness” in the Jewish Talmud. So also Tobit xii. 9, xiv. 11.

**2.** *Sound a trumpet before thee:* To be taken figuratively, as we talk of “trumpeting anything forth.”

### Verses 9—13.

The “Lord’s Prayer” (Paternoster) has here either six petitions or seven, according as we regard verse 13 as containing two petitions or the two aspects of a single one. Luke xi. 2—4 has five petitions, corresponding to the number of the fingers. The name of Father, to be explained by the relation between God and man required by v. 48, is only occasionally touched upon, as it were, by the Old Testament (Is. lxiii. 16; Ps. ciii. 13; Wisdom xxiii. 1), but it became with Jesus the intensely significant and defining name of God. The three first petitions have their source in the comprehensive rights of God, whom heaven and earth must serve. In the third petition the prayer descends from heaven to earth, there to deal with the wants, the limits and the restrictions of human life.

**11.** *Daily:* This translation of the Greek word, the exact meaning of which is difficult to define, is at any rate not far from the true meaning. If it were not for verse 34, one might translate “to-morrow’s,” i.e. sufficient for the coming day. The meaning is probably, “what is required for our subsistence, suited to our life,” the sense being that of Prov. xxx. 8.

**12.** *Forgive:* Probably we should read, “have forgiven” (comp. v. 23, 24).

**13.** This allows the possibility of being tempted by God (in spite of James i. 13), iv. 1; Job i. 12; Luke xxii. 31; 1 Cor. x. 13. The traditional rendering has many errors here. It has *from evil*, while the original probably refers to “the evil one,” i.e. the devil. It also contains the conclusion, *for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever Amen*, which is well known to have been introduced here from being used in the churches. That these words are an interpolation is clear, not only from the fact that they are wanting in all the oldest MSS., but also from the direct connection of verse 14 with what precedes.

**16.** Fasting, a primeval religious usage of the East, plays a part in the Old Testament as the expression and representation of a self-inflicted curtailment of life. It took the form especially

of penitent mourning, wailing, and tearing of clothes, the use of ashes and hair garments. From the time of the Babylonian captivity it had been regarded, like prayer and almsgiving, as a meritorious act having influence with God, and had been pursued by the Pharisees with the greatest possible display of a miserable appearance.

**17.** Anointing is a sign of joy. Men go to a feast anointed and washed (see Luke vii. 46).

#### Verses vi. 19—vii. 6.

Three prohibitions directed against earthly care, fault-finding and desecration of holy things.

**22.** *Thy whole body shall be full of light:* All its members are brought into the clear light, move as if in the light, receive direction and guidance by means of the healthy eye. The origin of the illustration is in Prov. xx. 27, “The breath of man is the candle of the Lord searching all the chambers of the body.”

**23.** What a night, when just that which ought to be light only serves to bury the man in darkness!

**24.** *Mammon* signifies, in the popular language of the time, “riches,” or “treasure,” here taken as an idol.

**27.** *Stature,* should be “time of life.” It is length of life not of the body that is spoken of. If it were the latter, a cubit would be an extraordinary addition, whereas here a very small amount is intended.

**28.** *Lilies:* they grow wild in the East.

**30.** Dry grass, with the flowers that grew amongst it, was used as fuel for the oven.

#### CHAPTER vii.

**6.** Dog and swine are of course traditional names for the Gentiles, but also for impure and vulgar-minded men generally (Phil. iii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 22). Such only desecrate and mock at the divine truth when it is surrendered to them. Comp. xxvi. 63, xxvii. 12, 14.

#### Verses 7—11.

A seventh section, in addition to the two threes, vi. 1—18, vi. 19—vii. 6, essentially a continuation of the address on prayer, vi. 5—15.

**12.** Final summary of the moral discourse and transition to

the concluding section. The thought is found in Tobit iv. 16, and elsewhere in the older Judaism.

**15.** “In sheep’s clothing:” see note on iii. 4. Transition from the way of life (13, 14) to the guides in it.

**22.** *Lord, Lord*: The address of Jewish pupils to their teachers. Comp. xxiii. 7—10.

**23.** The words of dismissal are from Ps. vi. 9, cxix. 115.

**28.** Concluding note to the Sermon on the Mount.

**29.** From Mark i. 22 = Luke iv. 32, where the first impression of the public appearance of Jesus is thus described.

### CHAPTER viii.

The section viii. 1—ix. 34 gives a selection of miracles, as ch. v.—vii. did of discourses. The passage xi. 5 refers to most of the miracles here narrated, and the selection is in some cases determined by it, as for instance the first of the present section.

**1.** This verse serves to connect what precedes with what follows.

Verses **2—4** = Mark i. 40—45.

**2.** *A leper*: See the detailed description in Levit. xiii. xiv. of this disease, one of the severest plagues of the East.—*Worshipped him*: should be, “fell down before him.” See note on ii. 2.

**3.** The result here goes beyond those cases of fever, or of persons possessed or lame, in which we can understand the effect of an overpowering will. We are reminded here of 2 Kings v. 9—14; Is. i. 6, xxv. 8, lxi. 1, symbolic of the deliverance of the people who were unclean in their sin and rejected. Hence this legendary exaggeration and confusion of an historical event. The real occurrence was only a declaration of cleanness, which the man, who has already recovered from the disease, asks of Jesus in order that he may be relieved from the necessity of the journey to Jerusalem required by the law. This interpretation of the passage is supported by the reservation (ver. 4) with which Jesus declares him clean, and seals the declaration by touching the man whom hitherto every one had avoided as unclean (ver. 3).

**4.** *The gift that Moses commanded*: Levit. xiv. 10, 21.—*For a testimony unto them*: in order that people may have a safe ground for considering that there would be no danger in intercourse with him.

Verses 5—13 = Luke vii. 1—10.

**5.** *A centurion*: i.e. “a captain over a hundred.” This was a Gentile or Samaritan, one of the soldiers of Herod Antipas, who had become a Jew (proselyte).

**6.** *My servant*: The Greek word may mean “boy,” “son.” Luke represents him as “servant,” John as “son” (John iv. 47).

**8.** As a Gentile, in proximity to whom Jews might easily become unclean.

**9.** A genuine soldier’s illustration: “If I, although obeying higher officers, can still execute my will by means of others who are subject to me, much more canst thou, who art subject to none, bid spirits of disease come and go without troubling thyself to come to the place.”

**11.** An echo of Is. xlv. 6, xlix. 12.

**12.** *The children of the kingdom*: i.e. those who have the first claim to it, the Jews.—*Into the outer darkness*: outside the brilliant hall where the Messianic wedding is held.

**13.** The remarks made on ver. 3 apply to this miracle also. In the words of Jesus there is too much genuine uninvented tradition for us to be able to relegate the whole to the sphere of legend. But that there is something legendary in the details is shown by the different accounts in the third and fourth Gospels.

Verses 14, 15 = Mark i. 29—31.

**14.** Peter was married (1 Cor. ix. 5), and his mother-in-law was living with him. Fevers are common in the damp marshy districts near the lake.

**15.** Jesus holds out his hand to her in greeting and sympathy. The cure is the involuntary result of his first act.—*And ministered unto them*: “and served them;” she attended to her guests.

**16** = Mark i. 32—34.

**17.** Only in Matt., a quotation from Isaiah liii. 4 to describe the prevailing sentiment of Jesus, compassionate sympathy springing from his intercourse with the suffering of the people. It will not allow him to give a cold refusal to the cry for miraculous help.

**18** = Mark iv. 35, which follows here instead of Mark i. 35.

Verses 19—22 = Luke ix. 57—60.

**20.** *The Son of Man*: Under this epithet, which is founded

upon Dan. vii. 13, 14, and is Jesus' favourite name for himself, he hides for a time his Messianic claims, and at the same time indicates that in his higher consciousness the Jewish Messianic idea extends to the whole human race. Comp. notes on ix. 6; Mark ii. 28.

**22.** *Let the dead bury their dead*: Let dead minds bury dead bodies. From the gloomy, unfruitful service of death in which men waste their time, which was wide-spread enough among the people at that time in Israel (see ix. 23), but was also a fundamental characteristic of the ancient religions generally, Jesus calls them away to the service of the highest life.

Verses 23—27 = Mark iv. 36—31.

**26.** The purely figurative and indeed artistic character of this physical miracle, which passes beyond the limits of all spiritual and moral means, is as plain as that the whole description is a growth, as it were, of which the germ is found in the Old Testament. Comp. Ps. cvi. 9, cvii. 25, 28—30; also Nahum i. 4; Hab. iii. 8; Jonah i. 1—16; Exod. xiv. 16, 21; and finally Ps. cxxi. 4. The first Evangelist alone represents Jesus as first rebuking his disciples and then the storm. The inverse and more natural order is found in the two others.

Verses 28—34 = Mark v. 1—20.

**28.** *Gergesenes*: A reading to which Origen first gave currency in place of “Gerasenes,” which was the common reading in his time. But according to Josephus nothing was left at this time of the Gergesenes mentioned in Gen. x. 16, xv. 21; Deut. vii. 1; Jos. xxiv. 11, except the name. Gerasa, again, lies about six times as far south of the lake as Gadara, though Gadara indeed is between two and three leagues inland. Unless the place here intended is a certain Kersa or Gersa on the east shore, which was only re-discovered in 1860, we should probably read with the oldest MSS. “Gadarenes.” All three readings are found also in Mark v. 1, Luke viii. 26.—*Out of the tombs*: Many caves are still found in the mountain limestone there which are used as burial-places.

**29.** *Son of God*: see note on ii. 15. Similarly, in Mark i. 24, 34, v. 7, it is the demoniacs who first give this title to Jesus. According to the popular belief of the Jews, the Messiah will

execute judgment upon the evil spirits (see note on iv. 1). Hence they suspect the greatness of Jesus, and are apprehensive as to their own lot; and they flee from him that he may not destroy them “before the time.” The description is based upon 1 Cor. xvii. 18.

**30. Swine:** Animals which were hated by the Jews. The inhabitants of the country east of the Jordan were mostly Gentiles. Jewish scorn seems to have a share in the delineation of this miracle. The silly devils, now that they cannot withstand Jesus’ entrance and maintain themselves in men, choose as their dwelling beasts unclean as themselves; but they are only drawn into a snare, for they provoke the beasts, which represent the sensuality of the Gentiles, as they had provoked men before, and are driven with them into the water, thence to descend into hell. The passage in Is. lxv. 4, 5, has also had some influence on this narrative: “Who sit in the tombs, and pass the night in caves; who eat swine’s flesh, and their dishes are abominable broth; who say, Stand by thyself, come not too near to me.”

**33. Into the city:** see note on ver. 28.

#### CHAPTER ix.

Verses 1—8 = Mark ii. 1—12.

**1.** This verse (= Mark v. 21) belongs to the preceding passage, which is here brought into connection with Mark ii. 1.

**2.** Jesus sees through the suffering features and countenance into the suffering soul. The disease was the consequence of sin. Compare with this verse Is. xxxiii. 24.

**3. Blasphemeth:** This is explained by Mark ii. 7

**5. Answer:**—Both are equally easy if it is only a matter of “saying,” both equally difficult to say with effect. The difference is, that the effect of the word “Arise” is seen immediately.

**6.** Jesus adds the word of power with which he heals the cripple as a sign that he, as the Son of Man (see note on viii. 20) forgives sins with equal authority and effect.—*On earth:* He forgives on earth as God does in heaven. Hence, Son of Man = “earthly representative of God in the forgiveness of sins.”

**7.** See note on iv. 24.

Verses 9—17 = Mark ii. 13—22.

**9. At the receipt of custom:** Capernaum was one of the towns

where customs were collected, on account of the great high road passing through it (see note on iv. 13).

10. *Sat at meat*: So rendered in accordance with our present custom. In this and all similar passages the original speaks of “lying at meat” [so lit. “came and lay down,” in latter part of this verse], according to the universal custom of that time of reclining on cushions at meal-times.

11. The strict adherents of the law among the Jews were especially scrupulous and obstinate in regard to eating and drinking with others. Comp. Gal. ii. 12.

13. The first Evangelist stands alone here and in xii. 7 in his reference to Hosea vi. 6.

14. See note on vi. 16.

15. The first sad foreboding. The question of fasting is left entirely to the decision of the disciples themselves. *Then shall they fast*, “then they will fast.”

16. Jesus refuses, as it were, to patch up the old Jewish coat with a new piece of better cloth. The division which had already taken place, and which was fundamental, *the rent*, would only be made worse; just as a patch of new (lit. “unfulled”) cloth put on an old garment will not long remain good, but shrinks the first time it gets wet. So this kind of conservative and traditional conduct is altogether suicidal, for which reason Jesus abstains entirely from giving any rule with regard to fasting, and pursues further the line indicated by Isaiah Iviii. 3—7.

17. So also, if one tried to keep the new fermenting wine in rotten old skins that would not hold it, it would only be wasted. *Bottles*: “skins.” The ancients usually kept their wine in goat-skins. The new reality must create its own forms of life and methods of expression suited to its joyous, enthusiastic spirit.

Verses 18—20 = Mark v. 21—43.

18. *A certain ruler*: Further explained by Mark v. 22 = Luke viii. 41. The Old-Testament foundation of the story is found in the account of Elijah at Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 17—24) and Elisha at Shunem (2 Kings iv. 17—37).

20. The woman suffering from an issue of blood for twelve years is the image of incurable uncleanness (Levit. xii. 7).—*The hem* should be “the tassel,” which was a part of the national costume of the Jews (Numb. xv. 38).

**23.** *Minstrels*: Flute-players, funeral music.

**24.** It is a disputed question whether the word “sleepeth” means the girl is really still alive (the Jews were always in a hurry to pronounce any one dead and get him buried), or that this death will prove to be merely temporary like a sleep.

### Verses 27—31.

These verses are only found in Matt. The event narrated is the same as in xx. 29—34 (see p. 9), introduced here in order to justify beforehand the words which follow in xi. 5, “the blind see.” On the healing of blind persons, see notes on xx. 30, Mark viii. 23.

### Verses 32—34.

To be viewed in the same light as the preceding narrative. The event is the same as in xii. 22—24. It is added here in order to bring the number of healings up to ten, and, through the natural connection of dumbness with deafness (Mark vii. 32), to prepare for the words, “the deaf hear,” in ix. 5.

**34.** *The prince of the devils*: see note on x. 25, a passage which is to be explained by the present one. Hence the fragment does not break off till after this verse.

Verses ix. 35—x. 42 = Mark vi. 6—13 = Luke ix. 1—6, x. 1—12.

**35.** Repetition of iv. 23 with reference to Mark vi. 6.

**36** = Mark vi. 34. The figure is taken from Numb. xxvii. 17; 1 Kings xxii. 17; Jer. iv. 6; Ps. cxix. 176.

## CHAPTER X.

Verses 1—14 = Mark vi. 6—11 = Luke ix. 1—5.

**1.** This idea that miraculous and spiritual powers are capable of being mysteriously communicated to others, is applied in the book of Acts to the relation between the apostles and their disciples (Acts viii. 15, 17, 19, xix. 6).

Verses 2—4 = Mark iii. 16—19.

**2.** *Apostles*: i. e. “messengers.” Their very number, taken from the number of the twelve tribes of Israel, shows what they are intended for (ver. 6). That the five disciples, all whom Jesus has so far called (iv. 18, 21, ix. 9), have been increased to twelve, is simply assumed in this Gospel. See note on Mark iii. 14.

**3.** *The publican*: “the tax-gatherer.”—*Lebbaeus* (“the stout-hearted”) is called Thaddæus in Mark iii. 18, and also here according to the received text. On the other hand, in Luke vi. 16, Acts i. 3, John xiv. 22, a certain Judas, son of James, appears in his place. The tradition is uncertain.

**4.** *Iscariot*: i.e. “man of Kerioth,” a city of the tribe of Judah.

### Verses 5—42.

A long charge to the apostles, in which the Evangelist includes all that Jesus imparted to those whom he sent forth at various periods of his ministry, and especially in his latter days.

**5, 6.** Only in Matt. (see p. 43).

**5.** *Samaritans*: This mixed people, springing from the Israelites who remained behind when the kingdom of the ten tribes was destroyed and the heathen colonists placed there by the Assyrians, was rendered the more utterly hateful to the Jews (see Eccles. iv. 26, 27) by the very fact that the worship on Mount Gerizim, near Sichem, was offered, like their own, to the one God, and was intended to take the place of the worship at Jerusalem (John iv. 20).

**6.** *Lost sheep*: see note on ix. 36. The first apostolic mission is restricted to Galilee, for it is limited on the south by “the Samaritan cities,” and on every other side by “the way of the Gentiles.”

**8.** *Raise the dead*, is wanting in many ancient MSS.—*Freely ye have received, freely give*: “Ye have received gratis, give gratis,” practically carried out by Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 18.

**9.** *Purses*: lit. “girdles,” which were so arranged that one could keep money in them.

**10.** They shall be supplied with the usual provision for a journey wherever they take up their quarters. This is the right of wandering labourers in the kingdom of God. They are to abstain altogether (in contrast to Israel in its wanderings, Exod. xii. 11) from regarding strangers as strangers.

**11.** Hospitality is to open the way for the spread of the new preaching of the kingdom, the most natural means to this day in the East. And here a long visit is preferred to quick change of quarters (comp. note on Luke x. 7).

**12.** Great importance is assigned to greetings among Eastern

nations. The most usual formula ("Peace be with you") is found as early as Judges xix. 20; 1 Chron. xii. 18.

**13.** *Let your peace return to you:* If your wish be unfulfilled, it will return to you, you will be none the poorer. The idea is taken from Is. lv. 11; 1 Kings xxii. 17 (also ix. 36, x. 6, from the passage in 1 Kings).

**14.** *Shake off the dust of your feet:* as something unclean that you refuse to take with you. Not even the least thing shall be any longer shared with those who will not receive the gospel. Comp. Luke x. 10, 11.

**15.** See Gen. xviii. xix.

### Verses 17—22 = Mark xiii. 9, 11—13.

**17.** Their lot among the Jews. The officials of the synagogues had a certain amount of judicial power, and were allowed to order thirty-nine stripes for religious offences. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 24; Acts xxii. 19.

**18.** Their lot among the Gentiles. A description of the experiences of those who came afterwards, Paul for example.—*Against them:* i.e. the Jews (ver. 17).

**23.** Only in Matt. Ere the apostles have quite completed their task even in Israel the Messiah will return as the judge of the world, appointed by God. There is no allusion here to Paul.

**25.** Only in Matt.—*Beelzebub* would be the Fly-god of Acron mentioned 2 Kings i. "Beelzebul," which we ought probably to read, is either simply another pronunciation of the same name, or denotes the Phœnician Sun-god as "Lord of the (heavenly) dwelling." In any case the false deity intended was regarded as the "prince of the devils" mentioned ix. 34.

**29.** Everything that happens, even the least and most fortuitous, is the work of God.—*Farthing:* the Roman as. See note on v. 26.

**34.** Contrast to the Messianic times of peace, Mic. iv. 3, v. 4, 5; Zech ix. 9, 10, in accordance with Exod. xxxii. 27; Ezek. vi. 3, xiv. 17, xxi. 12.

**35.** Founded on Micah vii. 6.

**36.** Only in Matt.

**38.** *His cross:* an expression which could scarcely be used of

evil borne in following Jesus until after the time when the way which he himself trod had ended on the cross.

**39.** The sacrifice of the material life is made the condition of the lasting attainment of life.

**41.** Only in Matt.—*In the name of a prophet*: With respect to the full meaning of the name “prophet;” as we should say, “in virtue of his office.” The expression is intended to denote the higher motive for receiving him. [Similarly “in the name of a righteous man,” and “in the name of a disciple,” ver. 42.]

### CHAPTER xi.

**1.** The charge given to the disciples when they are sent forth is of such supreme importance to the first Evangelist, that their actual dismissal (Mark vi. 12 = Luke ix. 6) disappears beneath a general concluding remark (see p. 44), and in xii. 1 we find the disciples again with Jesus as if nothing had happened.

Verses 2—19 = Luke vii. 18—35.

**3.** *He that should come*: The man of the future, taken from Ps. cxviii. 26, as a secret designation of the Messiah. Now for the first time the Baptist, roused to glowing expectations by the accounts he hears of Jesus, whom he formerly baptized among many others, begins to think that he may be aiming at a Messianic goal.

**5.** This utterance, which is compounded from Is. xxix. 18, 19, xxxv. 5, 6, lxi. 1 (comp. Luke iv. 18), and culminates in the blessing conferred upon the poor by the preaching of the gospel to them, can only, like the original passages, be meant figuratively of the spiritual results of his preaching, the healing of moral offences. Hence “the dead are raised up” (as in viii. 22; Luke xv. 24, 32). But our Evangelist has taken it literally, and so has been careful to introduce previously accounts of the restoration of the blind (ix. 27—31), the lame (viii. 5—13, ix. 1—8), lepers (viii. 1—4), the deaf (ix. 32—34), the dead (ix. 18, 19, 23—26), and finally of the preaching of the gospel which Jesus practised himself (ix. 35, xi. 1) and appointed to his disciples (x. 7).

**6.** While Jesus refers the decision and judgment to the inquirer, at the same time he lifts his hand in warning against any Messianic expectation that could look with contempt upon what

was to him the highest thing of all, the joyful message in the ears of oppressed and yearning souls.

10. The mark of the Baptist, from Mal. iii. 1.

11. Testimony to the powerful impression that the appearance of the Baptist had made upon Jesus himself. But now he feels himself essentially separated from him. His *kingdom of heaven* was different from the kingdom of God, as proclaimed by the last and greatest of the prophets in accordance with his predecessors.

12, 13. Insertion of a remark upon the crisis in the history of the coming kingdom of God, marked by the appearance of the Baptist. Until his time it was but a kingdom of God prophesied in the future ; from his time it has been possible for all to gain and possess it who rouse themselves to the assault and to decisive deeds of valour, such as are described in v. 29, 30, vi. 24, x. 37—39, xviii. 8, 9.

14. Not the actual Elijah, but the Elijah prophesied in Mal. iv. 5 (iii. 23). On the historical place of this saying, see note on xvii. 12.

16. Illustration of the position which the people have taken up in opposition to both the great teachers. They have been like wayward children, quarrelling over their games, whom nothing will satisfy.

17. *We have piped unto you* : Those addressed are the gloomy party of John. You have not accepted our call to a merry wedding-game.—*We have mourned unto you* : The party addressed is the wedding company (ix. 15) of the Messiah. You have not joined us when we chose to play at funeral processions and mourning ceremonies.

18. *Hath a devil* : is possessed, has gone mad.

19. *A friend of publicans and sinners* : comp. ix. 11.—*Is justified* : by the effect which she produces upon her followers.—*Of her children* : whose representative in the present case is Jesus himself.

Verses 20—24 = Luke x. 12—15.

21. *Chorazin* (otherwise unknown) and *Bethsaida* (Mark vi. 45, viii. 22; Luke ix. 10; John i. 44, xii. 21) were places on the lake, north of Capernaum. See note on xiv. 13.—*Tyre and Sidon* : the well-known great heathen cities on the sea-coast.—*Sackcloth and ashes* : a coarse, loose mourning garment, hanging like a sack

on the body and held together with a cord, and ashes which were sprinkled on the head or spread on the ground to lie in. Comp. Jonah iii. 5, 6, 8; Job xlvi. 6.

Verses 25—27 = Luke x. 21, 22.

The precious memory of a sacred hour of sad meditation and triumphant self-confidence.

**26.** Submission to the fact.

**27.** *All things*: according to what has preceded, this refers to success and failure, plentiful harvest and scanty. If he win “babes” only, that is God’s doing. With regard to the words which follow, this at any rate is clear, that they express the entirely unique nature of Jesus’ religious position as the exclusive Mediator to humanity of the highest spiritual truths, and that this is based upon the recognition of God as the Father, which was first perfected through him, and upon his recognition through the Father, which is only another aspect of the same thing. But unfortunately the reading which has come down to us is by no means certain. Much art was early brought to bear upon the passage. There is one reading especially which is at least as old as our present one, and in favour of which there is considerable testimony from the middle of the second century downwards: “No man knew the Father save the Son, nor the Son save the Father, and he to whom the Son will reveal it.”—[*Will reveal*, here and in the English version = “is willing to,” and is a correct translation of the ordinary reading.] The endeavour to place the Son in the eternal divine present, seems to have caused the suppression of the past tense of the verb.

Verses 28—30. Only in Matt.

The many, if only faint, echoes of Ecclesiasticus are remarkable (see Eccles. vi. 20, 25, 26, 30, 34, xiv. 21 sqq., li. 1, 10 sqq., 17, 23—27). Such passages also as Is. xiv. 3, xxviii. 12, lv. 1—3; Jer. vi. 16, xxxi. 2, 25; Prov. ii. 1, iv. 20, v 1, 12, find here their New-Testament revival and highest interpretation. And the passage itself is a most eloquent commentary on Jesus’ own idea of the Messiah in opposition to the popular expectations.

## CHAPTER xii.

Verses 1—8 = Mark ii. 23—28.

1. *Ears*: It must have been about Easter.

2. The act itself was not forbidden (Deut. xxiii. 25), nor is it in the East to this day. The ears are plucked, and the grain rubbed out in the hands and eaten.

3, 4. See 1 Sam. xxi. 1—6. Proof that, when in want (through hunger), one may eat what is forbidden. The shew-bread, which was laid in the holy place of the temple as an offering (Exod. xl. 23), being most holy, might only be eaten by the priests in the holy place (Levit. xxiv. 9). But the high-priest made an exception this time on condition that David and his men were clean. From this, the conclusion is here drawn that David had followers with him (corresponding to the disciples who are here immediately attacked), and that he himself entered the holy place (which would have been a further transgression of the law). Neither of these things is in the Old Testament. A further silent assumption of this argument is, that Jesus, as Messiah, is at least equal in rank to David, his prototype.

5—7. Only in Matt.

5. Apropos of the priests, he finds a second example applying directly to the Sabbath question which is before them, the labour of those who offer the sacrifices on the Sabbath. See Levit. xxiv. 8; Numb. xxviii. 9.

6. *One greater*: should be, “something greater.”—The priests receive a dispensation from the observance of the Sabbath, on account of the requirements of the temple which they serve. The Messiah is more than the temple, “the holy one of God” more than “the holy thing.” Comp. John ii. 19—21.

7. See note on ix. 13. [*I will have*: i.e. “I desire.”]

8. In any case, the Messiah, as supreme Lord of the kingdom of God, has the right of issuing decrees even with regard to the Sabbath.

Verses 9—14 = Mark iii. 1—6.

10. *His hand withered*: like Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiii. 4. The question put here in the mouth of the Pharisees is only suitable in the mouth of Jesus (Mark iii. 4 = Luke vi. 9).

11, 12. Appeal to the conduct of unsophisticated popular life,

as in Luke xiii. 15, xiv. 5, but here introduced quite inconsistently with the general connection.

**13.** After 1 Kings xiii. 6.

Verses 15—21. Only in Matt.

These verses contain an account of miraculous healings, which has a certain affinity with Mark iii. 7, 10, 12, but is more general.

**18—21.** The striking reserve with which he shrinks from publicity, the quiet activity of this Messiah, is to be explained by Is. xlvi. 1—4.

**21.** *Trust*: “hope.”

Verses 22—42 = Mark iii. 20—30 = Luke xi. 14—32.

**23.** On the occasion of a more remarkable cure of one possessed, the popular voice is for the first time heard to give utterance to the thought that Jesus might be the Messiah. Comp. note on viii. 29.

**24** = ix. 34.

**27.** See note on iv. 24.

**31.** *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*: “blasphemy against the Spirit.” They had not vilified him, at whose humble appearance they might take offence, but the holy power of God itself which was evidently working in him.

**33—35.** Part of this we have already had in vii. 16—20.

**34.** *Generation*: “brood.”

**39.** Jesus refuses on principle to work upon an imagination which desires displays of miraculous powers. The gospel narratives, which relate scarcely anything but miracles, or at any rate attach an immense value to them, afford a contrast to this which calls for the most thorough and careful investigation.—*Adulterous*: in the figurative language of the Old Testament, faithless to God (Hosea ii. 1 sqq., 16 sqq.).—*The sign of the prophet Jonas*: see xvi. 4. It consisted, according to Jonah i. 2, iii. 1—4, in the call to repentance.

**40.** An interpolation, for verse 41 belongs immediately after 39. The explanation is far-fetched, assumes beforehand the resurrection of Jesus, and is altogether unsuitable, inasmuch as the resurrection is represented as having taken place between thirty and forty hours after his death.

**41.** According to Jonah iii. 5 sqq., the “sign of Jonas” at least produced some fruits.—*A greater than Jonas is here*: “there is more than Jonas here.”

**42.** See 1 Kings x. 1 sqq.—*A greater than Solomon is here*: “there is more than Solomon here.”

Verses 43—45. See notes on iv. 1—24.

Verses 46—50 = Mark iii. 31—35.

**46.** *Brethren*: The connection with his mother requires us to understand that they were his own brothers by birth. See note on Luke ii. 7.

#### CHAPTER xiii.

Verses 1—34 = Mark iv. 1—34.

**3.** *Parables*: In the genuine Oriental style of Jesus’ teaching, in which the material always bears the spiritual within it, we never find a thought which his imaginative power cannot depict in vivid colours. And where physical and human life become a mirror for religious comparisons and types, not simply in individual characteristics (“brood of vipers,” “that fox Herod,” &c.), but also in a continuous course (e.g. in the growth of the seed), there the simple “illustration” or “metaphor” is carried out with loving care till it becomes a “parable” proper, such as had already served in the Old Testament to throw light upon the deepest secrets of the kingdom of God and the moral world (Judges ix. 8—15; 2 Sam. xii. 1—4; 2 Kings xiv. 9; Is. v. 1—7, xxviii. 23—29).

**10.** The form of the question, different from that of the collateral accounts, is made to correspond to the beginning of the answer.

**11.** This verse might in itself express the opinion, which is at any rate more natural, and lies at the foundation of Mark iv. 33, that Jesus gives the people figures to illustrate his meaning, because they are less apt and capable than the disciples in receiving what is altogether spiritual. But the connection with vv. 14—18 shows us that the first Evangelist takes the same theological view as Mark iv. 11, 12 = Luke viii. 10.

**12.** In Mark and Luke this verse follows later (Mark iv. 24, 25; Luke viii. 18). In the popular saying, Jesus finds a warning that, as in the market of life, so also in spiritual things, the rich

man grows richer, while the poor man easily becomes utterly destitute,—a warning which might induce Jesus for that very reason to come to the rescue of the wasting capital with his supply of enriching parables. But in the position in which our Evangelist puts the words, they are intended to explain why the receptive disciples, in addition to what they already possess (the parable which they have heard) receive still more (the explanation of it); while for the unreceptive multitude the apparent possession is completely deprived of all value, for though they have heard the parable, they do not understand it at the time, nor even on after-consideration.

**13.** Accordingly, the reason for speaking in parables is found in the indifference which manifests itself in not seeing and not hearing.

**14, 15.** Only in Matt. Taken from Is. vi. 9, 10, in the Greek translation. The saying of Isaiah with regard to a merely apparent acceptance of the word is fulfilled by the parable, which produces only an apparent possession.

**18.** In opposition to the people, the disciples see. They therefore are allowed to hear the explanation of the parable, the solution of the riddle is given to them.

**24—30.** The elements of the parable are the same as in Mark iv. 26—29, but here it is enriched by the companion illustration of ver. 25, which interrupts the gradual but regular development, and by the thought contained in it of the mingling of good and evil in the temporary appearance of the kingdom of God.

**25.** *Tares*: the poisonous darnel, which is very like wheat in appearance, but has black grains which have a narcotic influence.

### Verses 35—53. Only in Matt.

In Mark iv. 3—8, 26—32, we have a collection of three parables taken immediately from the same natural phenomenon (the growth of the seed). By the addition of these four, Matthew brings the number up to seven.

**35.** From Ps. lxxviii. 2.

**42.** *There shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth*: This was quite in place in viii. 12 = Luke xiii. 28, where they were thrust out of the brilliant hall into the cold, dark night. The first Evangelist, however, brings it forward on several other occasions, and

even in unsuitable places, as here and in ver. 50, where fiery torment is spoken of, not cold and darkness. [Unsuitable if we take Luther's version in the sense of "chattering of teeth." "Gnashing" or "grinding" is the correct translation.]

**43.** Imitated from Daniel xii. 3, "And the teachers [A.V "They that be wise"] shall shine as the brightness of the firmament."

**44—46.** Illustrations of the inestimable value of the kingdom of heaven.

Verses 54—58 = Mark vi. 1—6.

**54.** *His own country* should be "his own city."

**55.** *Joses*: Some of the MSS. call him Joseph, which was also the father's name.

**57.** *In his own country* should be "in his own city."

#### CHAPTER xiv.

Verses 1, 2 = Mark iv. 14—16.

**2.** *Therefore*: i.e. in accordance with his wonderful re-appearance. The historical Baptist had performed no miracles (John x. 41).

Verses 3—12 = Mark vi. 17—29.

**3.** *For Herodias' sake* ("on account of Herodias"), *his brother Philip's wife*: An unhistorical account. Herodias was the wife of another brother of Antipas. It was her daughter Salome who was Philip's wife. See note on ii. 22.

**4.** No doubt Antipas, who was married to a daughter of Aretas (2 Cor. xi. 32), king of Arabia, entered into an unlawful connection with Herodias, and it led to a marriage which was doubly to be condemned, on the one hand as being unfaithful to the daughter of Aretas and to his brother, and on the other hand as a marriage within the forbidden degrees of relationship (Levit. xviii. 16, xx. 21).

**5.** The historian Josephus gives, as the reason for the murder, simply the fear of the popular movement which John's preaching of the kingdom had given rise to, which might easily have led to a great revolution.

**6.** *Birthday*: "anniversary." The Greek word may mean either "birthday" or "anniversary of his accession." Herod was at that time more than sixty years old, Herodias nearly fifty, and

Salome at least twenty. Salome was probably already a widow, at any rate she was not the “damsel” which she is assumed to be here and is called in verse 11.

7. For the basis of this legend in the Old Testament, see note on Mark vi. 23.

8. *Charger*: “dish.”

9. *And the king was sorry*: This is only intelligible after Mark vi. 19, 20, not after Matt. xiv. 5.

10. *In the prison*: According to Josephus, John died in the mountain fortress of Machærus on the Arabian frontier east of the Dead Sea; but according to Mark vi. 21, the feast was held in Galilee. This makes the speedy succession of events as here narrated impossible.

#### Verses 13—21 = Mark vi. 30—34.

13. *On foot*: Jesus had met his disciples again at Capernaum (Mark vi. 30), and had crossed over from there to the most northern point of the east shore of the lake (Luke ix. 10). The people “out of the cities” of the north-western shore (probably we should understand, in addition to Bethsaida, the Chorazin mentioned in xi. 12), who wanted to overtake him by going on foot along the northern shore of the lake, would be able to reach their goal in a few hours.

14. *Went forth* should be “went out.”

15. *The time is now past* should be “the daytime is already past”—It is high time to dismiss the people, in order that they may divide themselves among the villages lying in a wide circle round about, and find shelter and food. It is understood that their minds have been lifted all day above earthly wants and the thought of material provision (Mark vi. 34).

18. Only in Matt. Some suppose that Jesus, by making a beginning with the provisions of those immediately around him, called forth a grand manifestation of hospitality and neighbourly kindness on the part of others who had some provisions and were equally willing to deny themselves. But if so, this kernel of historical recollection is here quite concealed under an Old-Testament colouring of miracle.

19. In the first place, the occurrence is exalted to the level of the ancient Christian love-feast, by the similarity of this verse

to xxvi. 26. According to 1 Cor. x. 3, the manna of the Old Testament (see note on ver. 21) was also a type of the Lord's Supper. See note on Mark vi. 41.—*He blessed*: “he gave thanks” [more exactly, “he offered a blessing”].

**20.** *And were filled*: taken from v. 6, “they shall be filled.” *Twelve baskets*: each apostle collects into one.

**21.** *Five thousand men*: corresponding to the five loaves in ver. 17. One loaf feeds a thousand men. Thus Elisha is surpassed, who, according to 2 Kings iv. 42—44, fed a hundred men with twenty barley loaves. In the Old-Testament narrative should be noticed especially Elisha's words, “Give unto the people that they may eat” (= ver. 16), the servant's objection, “How can I set this before a hundred men to eat?” (= ver. 17, John vi. 9), and the result, “Then they ate and left some over” (= ver. 20). Additional Old-Testament legends which help to explain this are found in the accounts of other acts of Elisha (2 Kings iv. 38), of Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 7—16) and of Moses (Exod. xvi. 8 sqq., where we have quails instead of fishes, but the latter again in Numb. xi. 21, 22). Moreover, according to the teaching of the Rabbis (Midrash Koheleth), the Messiah will perform the same miracles as Moses. Finally, we also see here the lingering influence of the poetic idea of the satisfying of the hungry wanderers in the wilderness by God's miraculous help (Ps. cvii. 4—9). Taken as actual history, the miracle not only contradicts the stern reality of the self-denying life of Jesus generally, but is directly opposed to his words in iv. 4; while at the same time that very passage, pointing out that man lives not by bread alone, but by every word of God, throws light upon the original contents of the present narrative (see note on ver. 15). This is made still clearer by the continuation of the narrative in the discourse upon “the bread of life” in John vi. 48 sqq. The fundamental idea which is thus artistically realized, is at any rate the idea of this spiritual bread which Jesus gives in the wilderness of earthly existence, distributing it by his apostles. A single word satisfies thousands; and the heavenly treasure, which increases by use, is found after every distribution still unexhausted. See note on xvi. 9, 10.

Verses 22—33 = Mark vi. 45—52.

**23.** *Evening*: the later part of the evening, about sunset, in

distinction from the early part of the evening mentioned in ver. 15.

**24.** A legendary repetition of the first storm in viii. 24.

**25.** *In the fourth watch of the night:* i.e. between three and six o'clock in the morning. The Romans had introduced into Palestine this division of the night into four parts (mentioned in order by name in Mark xiii. 35), in place of the ancient Jewish division into three parts (Exod. xiv. 24). According to the passage from Mark (xiii. 35), it is not known in which of the four watches of the night the Messiah will come to deliver his people. This is one of the things which has given rise to our present legend. Other causes are found in Old-Testament figures, as that God walks upon the sea as upon dry ground (Job ix. 8), that His paths went through great waters wherein His footprints could not be traced (Ps. lxxvii. 19), that Moses and Joshua, and above all Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings ii. 8, 14), passed dry-foot through the water.

**28—31.** Story of Peter; only in Matt.

**31.** *Thou of little faith:* contrast to Heb. xi. 29.

**33.** Only in Matt. Really it was not till a later time that one of the disciples thus confessed him (see p. 46).

**34.** *Land of Gennesaret:* a district about three miles broad, and not much longer, lying to the south of Capernaum.

#### CHAPTER xv.

Verses 1—20 = Mark vii. 1—23.

**1.** The position which Jesus occupied with regard to the law had become uncertain. A declaration of his principles is demanded.

**2.** *The tradition of the elders:* the commandments of the ancients, developed from the time of Ezra by a succession of great scribes, and handed down from generation to generation as a sacred ordinance, a kind of unwritten law, supported by Deut. iv. 14, vii. 11.—*They wash not their hands:* It was not long before this time that the two great teachers Hillel and Shammai had revived the command, founded on Levit. xv. 11, to wash the hands at the beginning and the end of a meal.

**3.** Jesus replies by a question resting upon the distinction between the traditions, as the word of man, and the written law, as the word of God.

**4.** As an example, the commandment, Exod. xx. 12, with the more definite provision, Exod. xxii. 17.

**5.** The scribes declared the gifts to the temple binding, even when the fulfilment of the vow involved the transgression of the first moral commandments, in the present case the duty of supporting one's parents.—*He shall be free*: The unfinished Greek sentence may be thus completed, i.e. “He may do so, he is free from the command to give to his parents the divinely-appointed honour.”

**8, 9.** Is. xxix. 13.

**11.** *That which goeth into the mouth*: because they are speaking of eating (ver. 2). The more general and correct expression is found in Mark vii. 15.

**12, 13.** Only in Matt.

**13.** That which God hath not planted is the Pharisaic tradition (vv. 3, 6, 9).

**15.** *This parable*, according to verse 17, means the saying in verse 11, and not what immediately precedes; but in the form in which the first Evangelist has it, this is itself rather an explanation than a parable. See note on Mark vii. 15.

Verses 21—28 = Mark vii. 24—70.

**21.** *The coasts*: i.e. “the regions of Tyre and Sidon.” The possessions of these chief cities of Phœnicia extended far to the east, into the land of Galilee.

**22.** *A woman of Canaan*: a Gentile. The Phœnicians were descendants of the ancient Canaanites.—*Came out of the same coasts*: “went from within their borders.” According to the first Evangelist, we must not suppose that Jesus himself entered the heathen territory.

**23, 24.** Like x. 6, only in Matt. (see p. 43).

**26.** See note on vii. 6.—Hitherto Jesus' mission has been deliberately and intentionally confined to the Jews. It is only by experiences such as the present one, and that of viii. 5—13, that he is impelled to turn from the Jews to the Gentiles.

**27.** Acknowledgment of the principle of Jesus; but it will not be overthrown if just one blessing out of all the treasure that Israel has received be allowed as an exception to fall on Gentile ground.

**29** = Mark vii. 31.

Verses **30, 31**. Only in Matt.

Introduction to the second miraculous feeding, after the example of xiv. 14.

Verses **32—39** = Mark viii. 1, 10.

A second story of feeding a multitude, in which, however, we have only another edition of the first in a new form. Hence the disciples are in despair at the thought of feeding the people, just as if the first miracle had never occurred. Similarly, we have two accounts of the manna, Exod. xvi. 2 sqq., and Numb. xi. 4 sqq.

**37** *Seven baskets full*: according to the number of the loaves. The number is different in xiv. 20.

**39.** *Magdala*, according to another reading “*Magada*,” at the southern extremity of the land of Gennesaret, mentioned in xiv. 34. The journeys that follow upon the feeding coincide, like the feedings themselves.

#### CHAPTER xvi.

Verses **1—4** = Mark viii. 11, 12.

**1.** *A sign from heaven*: i.e. a clear, indisputable miracle accomplished in sight of all, a sign from God intelligible to all in favour of the Messiah, just what the multiplication of the loaves would have been if taken as actual history. See note on iv. 7.

**2, 3.** An interpolation of the first Evangelist, who connects the “signs of the time” in Luke xii. 54—56 with the “sign from heaven,” because the former are symbolized by “signs in the sky.”

**4.** *The sign of the prophet Jonas*: an addition of the first Evangelist (see note on xii. 40). As he refers this to the resurrection, he has placed the Sadducees, who deny the resurrection, with the Pharisees (vv. 1, 6, 11, 12), in order that they may be disposed of at the same time.

Verses **4—12** = Mark viii. 13—21.

**5.** *To the other side*: from the west shore to the east.

**6.** *Leaven*: in xiii. 33 = Luke xiii. 21, it represents the tendency of the good to develop; here and in 1 Cor. v. 6—8 and Gal. v. 9, the contaminating power of evil.

**9, 10.** By the recollection of the experience here appealed

to, the disciples are to be led to a right understanding of the words of Jesus as figurative. It is impossible, then, that the experience itself can have been such as would be involved by a literal interpretation of the accounts of the feeding of the multitudes. Moreover, after Matt. iv. 4, it is impossible to suppose that Jesus led his disciples to console themselves in every accidental and temporary deficiency of provisions by the thought of his miraculous powers. He had spoken, therefore, of the bread of life, which, unlike to earthly bread, has power to feed thousands without itself diminishing (see note on xiv. 21).

**12.** The interpretation of the leaven as the teaching [A. V “doctrine”] of the Pharisees is as far from being exhaustive as the interpretation of it as their hypocrisy, which is given in Luke xii. 1. It can only mean the whole Pharisaic school of thought.

Verses 13—28 = Matt. viii. 27—ix. 1.

**13.** *Cæsarea Philippi*: the ancient Paneas, which had been restored by Philip the Tetrarch in honour of the emperor Augustus, to whom Herod the Great had already previously built a temple there. It was situated on the borders of ancient Israel, near Dan; but this territory was now altogether heathen, and belonged to the province of Syria. The city stands at the foot of Mount Hermon, surrounded by magnificent scenery, and near the springs of the “lesser Jordan.” It was here that Jesus saw “all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them” (iv. 8). Here, after an inner struggle and victory (comp. ver. 26), he turned away again to make his last journey to the south, while at the same time he put to his disciples the decisive question which had long trembled on his lips.—[*Coasts*: lit. “parts,” i.e. neighbourhood.]

**14.** See note on Mark vi. 15. Jeremiah, to whom had been assigned, on the ground of 2 Macc. ii. 1—8, the part of a precursor similar to that of Elijah, is also mentioned by the first Evangelist only in ii. 17, xxvii. 9.

**16.** Within sight of the imperial Gentile city (Cæsarea), where sacrifice and worship are offered to the emperor Augustus as a god, a refugee who has fled from the persecutions of his opponents in Galilee, now for the first time, and in the narrow circle of his intimate friends, is by the comprehensive utterance of

Peter, which unites all former impressions in one great and portentous name, formally acknowledged as the Messiah.

**17—19.** Only in Matt.; composed according to the ideas of the “church” which passed current in Jewish-Christian and Petrine circles. This word is not found in the mouth of Jesus anywhere else except in the passage xviii. 17, which must be regarded precisely in the same way. See note on xviii. 18.

**17.** *Flesh and blood*: comp. Gal. i. 16. The expression denotes men, the human in opposition to the divine.

**18.** A corresponding acknowledgment on the part of Jesus in favour of Peter, the first herald of his Messiahship. Old-Testament basis of the figure, in Is. xxviii. 16. Comp. also Gal. ii. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11; Rev. xxi. 14.—*Church*: community, ecclesia, or church.—*The gates of hell* are strong, for they suffer none to come out again; but they shall not prevail against it, i.e. they shall not prove stronger than the building of the church. Comp. xii. 29.

**19.** Peter shall be steward (Luke xii. 41, 42) and bearer of the keys (comp Is. xxii. 22) in the house of Jesus, as, according to Rev. iii. 7, Jesus is in the house of God. Hence his permissions and prohibitions shall be regarded as valid even before God himself (“in heaven”). To *bind* and to *loose* signifies, in the language of the Rabbis, to declare forbidden or permissible. Many things that the school of Shammai “bound,” the school of Hillel “loosed.”

**21.** From the command to restrain their feelings of Messianic triumph (ver. 20), Jesus proceeds formally to damp any such feeling by predicting a lot which he was to suffer, which according to Jewish ideas was absolutely impossible (1 Cor. i. 23). But this scene of suffering and death could not, if Jesus himself believed in his own Messiahship, form the final background of his expectations. The first part of this saying, in which he speaks of his sufferings, has evidently been completed and made more definite in accordance with after experiences (see especially xx. 18, 19), and the other side of the picture seems also to have undergone the same treatment. Jesus spoke of his ascension to heaven, probably also of his return, and in any case of the results of his labour, which more than compensated for the sacrifice of his life, somewhat in the style of Ps. cxviii. 17. This speech of his was

afterwards transformed into a prediction of his “rising again on the third day” (after Hos. vi. 2); but after his death, his disciples do not appear to have been by any means prepared for this.

**22.** The indescribable perplexity which this announcement could not but cause among the disciples, finds expression in words of terrified affection. *Be it far from thee*, should be, “God be gracious unto thee.”

**23.** See note on iv. 10.—*Savourest not*: “thinkest not.” [See Rom. viii. 5.]

**24.** *His cross*: The condemned were compelled to drag their cross themselves to the place of execution. Hence this verse contains an intensification of the “offence;” the same “way of the cross” being placed before the disciples also as inevitable. Comp. note on x. 38.

**25.** *For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it*: “For whosoever desires to save his life shall lose it, and whosoever loses his life for my sake shall find it.” Selfish gain of life is but the loss of life when tried by the divine standard.

**26.** See notes on 13, and iv. 8.—*In exchange for his soul*: “as a ransom for his soul.” In accordance with the views of the ancient Hebrews, slaves, for example, could be freed from their position of slavery by the payment of a certain sum for their redemption. And there were many ways in which a man might buy freedom or be ransomed. But in Ps. xlix. 8, 9, and here, we find the limits of the possible. Nothing equals the soul in value, so that once lost it can never be redeemed; but without it, the whole world, the sum and substance of all enjoyment, is worthless, ceases indeed to be a reality.

**27.** It was by the belief in his return that the obstacle which seemed to overthrow the Messiahship of Jesus (namely, the contrast between his actual lot and the Messianic expectations, with the whole religious system of the earliest Christianity), was removed, not only from the minds of the earliest Christians, but also, unless we can declare a whole multitude of Christ’s sayings to be unauthentic, from the mind of Jesus himself.

**28.** This belief in his return has no value, unless the return itself is to be speedy, and to compensate superabundantly for the deficiencies of the miserable reality. Hence all the books of the

New Testament, without exception, down to John xxi. 23 and 2 Peter iii. 9, 10, teach the doctrine of the speedy return.

### CHAPTER xvii.

Verses 1—9 = Mark ix. 2—9.

**1.** *After six days*: the time from Peter's acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah to the transfiguration appears as a festival week, as in Exod. xxiv. 16 the glory of God in a cloud covers Mount Sinai for six days, until the revelation follows on the seventh. In compensation for xvi. 21, and as a pledge of what was said in xvi. 28 (comp. 2 Pet. i. 16—18), the Gospel legend here introduces, in immediate connection with the complete and active Messiahship, one of its most brilliant pictures, after an Old Testament original; the climax of all physical miracles, the artistic formation of which is here most fully demonstrable.—*Into a high mountain*: a mountain which is as little to be looked for in the actual world as the one mentioned in iv. 8. Represented after Ps. lxxviii. 16—18 (comp. ver. 19 = Eph. iv. 8), it corresponds here to Sinai, which Moses ascends with his three most intimate companions, in order that he may behold the God of Israel in the glorified sapphire depths of heaven (Exod. xxiv. 9, 10).

**2.** *Transfigured*: strictly, “changed.” Those who in the early ages of Christianity denied that Jesus had a material body appealed to this passage. The passage itself is founded on the brilliancy of the face of Moses as he descended from Sinai, represented in 2 Cor. iii. 7—11 as a type of Christ. So we see the glory of God in the face of Christ (2 Cor. iv. 4, 6), and are ourselves thereby transfigured (2 Cor. iii. 18). There is also a moment of transfiguration in Acts vi. 15.

**3.** How should the disciples know the names of the two figures? From their question in ver. 10, it appears rather that they missed the appearance of Elijah. Moses the lawgiver, and Elijah the representative of prophecy—the former a prophet of the Messiah (Deut. xviii. 15 = Matt. xvii. 5), the latter (according to Mal. iv. 5) to be his precursor—these two here acknowledge the Messiah as greater than themselves. Moreover, both were regarded as having been miraculously taken hence and carried into heaven.

**4.** *It is good for us to be here*: better, “It is well that we are

here.”—*Tabernacles*: “huts,” made of bushes and leafy branches of trees.

**5.** *A bright cloud*: as Moses (Exod. xxiv. 18) stood in the midst of the cloud, which is a symbol of the Divine presence.—*A voice out of the cloud*: so God speaks to Moses (Exod. xxxiii. 9—11). The utterance here is from Psalm ii. 7, Is. xlvi. 1, Deut. xviii. 15. The thought which filled the mind of Jesus at the moment of his baptism (see iii. 17, which the first Evangelist repeats more exactly word for word than the others) flowed from him in these last Galilean days into the souls of the disciples. Now Jesus was to them the Messiah, the Son of God. The solitary acknowledgment of Peter is now increased three-fold.

**6.** Is. vi. 5; Dan. viii. 17, x. 7—9, 16, 17. In Mark ix. 6, Luke ix. 34, the fear falls upon the disciples earlier.

**7.** Only in Matt.; from Dan. viii. 18, x. 10, 16, 18.

**9.** The origin of the present representation cannot be explained until the belief in the resurrection has arisen, and given the key to the understanding of the transfiguration as a prophecy of the return of Jesus in glory.

### Verses 10—13 = Mark ix. 10—13.

**10.** From the time of the declaration at Cæsarea Philippi, the Messianic question occupies the thoughts of the disciples. One of their chief difficulties lay in the non-fulfilment of the promise in Mal. iv. 5 (iii. 23).

**11.** *Shall restore all things*: According to Mal. iv. 6 (iii. 24), he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and that of the children to the fathers.

**12.** Here belongs xi. 14. The task of the precursor was frustrated by the opposition of the priests (Matt. xxi. 32). So also the Messiah shall end his life in a different way from what the promises give to expect, even as he has appeared in a different way (comp. note on x. 34). Jesus teaches the disciples to see in the termination of John’s career the type of his own end.

**13.** Only in Matt.

### Verses 14—21 = Mark ix. 14—29.

**15.** *Lunatic*: see note on iv. 24.

**17.** According to ver. 20, this rebuke is addressed to the disciples.

**20.** For the figurative language (as in xxi. 21), compare 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

**21.** This verse is wanting in some very old MSS.—*This kind*: so deep-rooted an evil.

Verses 22, 23 = Mark ix. 30—32.

Verses 24—27. Only in Matt.

**24.** *Tribute money*: not the Roman poll-tax (see xxii. 17, 19), but the temple-tax, consisting of two drachmæ, i.e. half a shekel (about 1s. 8d.) per head. According to Exod. xxx. 11—16, each Israelite must from his twentieth year pay (“as a ransom for his soul,” Exod. xxx. 12) this tax, by which the treasury of the temple was filled. The time for its collection was the month of Adar (March).

**26.** Spoken from the consciousness that he was the Messiah, i.e. Son of God, who might himself lay claim to royal privileges in Israel.

**27.** See note on iii. 15. *A piece of money*: the Greek is “a stater,” which contains four drachmæ (see note on ver. 24). The direction itself is to be understood figuratively, like the expression, “fishers of men,” iv. 19; unless, indeed, legend has appended a miraculous fulfilment to the direction to earn the required amount by fishing.

#### CHAPTER xviii.

Verses 1—5 = Mark ix. 33—37.

**3** = Mark x. 15.

**5.** *Shall receive*: i.e. affectionately, Rom. xii. 16.—*One such little child*: type of the most lowly and unassuming.—*In my name*: with regard to the fact that I have commanded it, and it is in accordance with my spirit (see note on x. 41).

Verses 6—9 = Mark ix. 42—48.

**6.** *Millstone*: properly “donkey millstone,” of a mill which was turned by a donkey, greater therefore than the millstone of an ordinary hand-mill (see note on xxiv. 41).

**7.** Only in Matt.

**8, 9.** Repetition from v. 29, 30.

Verses 10—14. Only in Matt.

**10.** Based on the idea of guardian angels of individual persons.

The nearness of the former to the throne of God is proportionate to the worth of the latter.

11. Is wanting in some very old MSS.

Verses 15—22.

Only Matt. (vv. 16—21) goes so far beyond Luke xvii. 3, 4.

15. *Tell him his fault*: “rebuke him” (Levit. xix. 17).

16. After Deut. xix. 15. *Every word*: “every matter.”

17. *The church*: see note on xvi. 17—19.

18. See note on xvi. 19. The authority there given to Peter is here extended to the whole community.

20. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.

22. The number of times which Lamech, on the other hand, desired to be revenged (Gen. iv. 24).

Verses 23—35. Only in Matt.

24. *Ten thousand talents*: two and a quarter million pounds.

25. The ancient law of debt in its mildest form, Levit. xxv. 39, 40; comp. 2 Kings iv. 1.

26. *Worshipped him*: see note on ii. 2.

28. *An hundred pence*: a hundred denarii, i. e. about three pounds.—*Took him by the throat*: as creditors were probably accustomed to drag their debtors into court.

34. *Tormentors*: Herod had introduced torturers for the first time into Israel; here simply jailors are meant.

CHAPTER xix.

Verses 1—9 = Mark x. 1—11.

1. *Beyond Jordan*: here “Judea” comes to an end, so that the expression must refer to the road through Peræa which Jesus chose.

3. *For every cause*: the question as to the ground of divorce, whether every cause was sufficient, &c. See note on v. 31.

4. Jesus goes back to the very alphabet of the natural creation, Gen. i. 27.

5. Gen. ii. 24.

7. Over against the command contained in the natural order of creation, stands the supplementary provision, Deut. xxiv. 1.

8. *Because of the hardness of your hearts*: yielding to the sensual obstinacy of the popular character.

## 9. Repetition of v. 32.

Verses 10—12. Only in Matt.

12. Properly understood, the saying of the disciples in ver. 10 is true, viz. in relation to those who are morally eunuchs, as, for instance, Jesus himself, and before him John the Baptist, and after him the apostle Paul (1 Cor. vii. 1, 7, 28—38), in opposition to those who are literally born eunuchs or have been made so.

Verses 13—15 = Mark x. 13—16.

13. *Laid his hands upon them*: to bless them, as was the custom of the scribes and teachers.

14. Comp. Gehazi and the Shunammite before Elisha, 2 Kings iv. 27.—*Of such*: of those who are as unassuming and impenetrable.

Verses 16—26 = Mark x. 17—27

16. *Good* (before *master*) is not in the oldest MSS.—*Good thing*: What special good thing? Different in Mark x. 17 = Luke xviii. 18.

17. *Why callest thou me good?* The oldest MSS. give a question corresponding to the question that has been asked, “Why askest thou me about the good?” Look to God, who is good; then thou shalt know what the good is. It is different in Mark x. 18 = Luke xviii. 19.

18. From Exod. xx. 13—16.

19. From Exod. xx. 12, Levit. xix. 18. The second of these two quotations is found in the first Gospel only.

20. *Young man*: because in Mark x. 20 = Luke xviii. 21, mention is made of his youth, but that only shows that he was not a young man any longer. Similarly he says here, *What lack I yet?* because in Mark x. 21 = Luke xviii. 22, we have, “One thing thou lackest.”

21. Jesus receives so favourable an impression of him (comp. Mark x. 21) that he is willing to receive him into the more intimate circle of disciples, the number of which is already closed. But the necessary condition, which had been easy for the first disciples (iv. 20, 22), he could not bring himself to comply with.

24. A similar proverb in xxiii. 24.

Verses 27—30 = Mark x. 28—30.

28. An interpolation.—*In the regeneration*: comp. Acts i. 6,

iii. 21 ; Rev. xxi. 1 sqq.—*In the throne*: comp. Rev. iii. 21. Here, as in Rev. vii. 4—9, the twelve tribes of Israel, represented by the twelve apostles (comp. Rev. xxi. 14), appear as the nucleus of the new people of the covenant.

**29.** To be explained by Rom. viii. 38, xvi. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 22, iv. 15; 2 Cor. vi. 8—10. Comp. also Acts ii. 44, iv. 32.

**30.** *Many that are first*: i.e. in position in the present world. In the world to come this will be reversed. There, those who have given up everything here, and so appear as “the last,” will be “the first.” Possibly this saying contains a hint for the self-satisfied questioner of ver. 27.

## CHAPTER XX.

### Verses 1—16. Only in Matt.

A parable as an explanation of that which is put at the beginning (xix. 30) and end (xx. 16) in the form of a proverb, and which our Evangelist is reminded of by the incident in vv. 8, 9. In this connection, standing between the ambitious question of Peter (xix. 27) and the desire of the sons of Zebedee for pre-eminence (xx. 21), the parable can only be directed against the Jewish claims generally, and serve to establish the principle that God’s reward is of grace.

**1.** *Early in the morning*: According to the Eastern division of the day, six o’clock is the first hour.

**2.** *A penny*: a denarius, at that time a very respectable day’s wages.

**8.** *Even*: six o’clock, the twelfth hour.

**16.** The second half of this verse is a later addition from xxii. 14.

Verses 17—19 = Mark x. 32—34. See note on xvi. 21.

Verses 20—28 = Mark x. 35—45.

**20.** *The mother*: According to Mark x. 35, the sons themselves, and the answer is addressed directly to them.

**21.** *On thy right hand and on thy left*: the places of honour. After the three-fold announcement of the sufferings he was to undergo (xvi. 21, xvii. 22, xx. 17, 18), only to be explained on the supposition that the followers of Jesus always let the terrible

thought of his death slip away from their minds, while they clung to words like those of xix. 28.

**22.** *Cup*: the standing symbol in the Old Testament for fate, and a painful lot (e.g. Is. li. 17; Jer. xlix. 12). So also xxvi. 39. The same lot of death is also symbolized by baptism (Luke xii. 50), by the closing of the water over the head of him who is immersed (Ps. xlvi. 8, lxix. 2, 3, 16, cxxiv. 4).

**23.** Jesus promises that they shall share his lot, but this is not to serve as an assurance of any greater satisfaction of their ambition afterwards.

**26.** *Minister*: “servant.”—[*Will be*: i.e. “desires to be.”]

**28.** *Not to be ministered unto, but to minister*: “Not to be served, but to serve.” Developed in Phil. ii. 7, 8.—*A ransom*: see notes on xvi. 26, xvii. 24; what no one, according to these passages, can give either for himself or for another, Jesus is in a position to offer to God in place of many, who would attempt this in vain for themselves. His life, voluntarily sacrificed in the service of men, is at the same time the personal benefit, on the ground of which he requires self-sacrificing service to the brethren as a fundamental law in his kingdom as contrasted with earthly kingdoms. In this thought Jesus himself becomes reconciled to his inevitable earthly defeat, and in its continuous energy and eternal truth lies the reconciling power of his death.

#### Verses 29—34 = Mark x. 46—52.

**29.** *A great multitude*: In Jericho the journey of Jesus and his disciples took the form of a Messianic triumphal march.

**30.** *Two blind men*: see p. 45, and note on ix. 27—31. According to Mark x. 46 = Luke xviii. 35, there was only one; but the narrative of his recovery is the only one among all the accounts of healing the blind (see note on Mark viii. 23) which is intimately connected with the course of the history, inasmuch as this last exercise of healing power resulted in a journey to Jerusalem.—*Thou Son of David*: This declaration of his Messiahship, after some opposition at first (ver. 31), is soon taken up by the whole multitude of followers (hence xxi. 9).

**34.** *Their eyes received sight*: lit. “They saw again.” Hence it is not a case of blindness from birth, but of disease.

## CHAPTER xxi.

## Verses 1—11.

1. *Bethphage*: i.e. “Fig-house,” the name of a place somewhere on or near the Mount of Olives, which was only separated from the Temple Mount by the valley of Kidron. It was one of the suburbs of Jerusalem, which the Jewish Talmud still reckons as within the precincts of the city itself.

2. *An ass and a colt*: two beasts, because of ver. 5.

4, 5. Only in Matt. Quotation from Zech. ix. 9, with introduction from Is. lxii. 11. Riding upon an ass instead of on a war-horse is symbolical of the peaceful character of the Messianic kingdom of Jesus.

7. Comp. 2 Kings ix. 13. *Thereon*: The original here is in the plural [“upon them”], which is certainly quite inconceivable.

8. *Hosanna*: i.e. “Pray give salvation.” The cry is a free imitation of Ps. cxviii. 25, 26.—*He that cometh*: see note on xi. 3.

10, 11. Only in Matt.

## Verses 12—17 = Mark xi. 15—19.

12. In what was called the forecourt of the Gentiles, a market had gradually been established, in which oxen, doves, and other requisites for sacrifice, were offered for sale, and where money-changers changed the money of various nations (especially for foreign visitors to the festivals), with some deduction, into the two-drachma pieces in which the temple-tax must be paid (see note on xvii. 24). Thus the temple had become fair, cow-house, bazaar and dove-cote, and the bargaining and cheating, which as a necessary consequence was continually going on, was most disturbing to the worshippers.

13. A combination of Is. lvi. 7 (house of prayer) and Jer. vii. 11 (den of thieves).

14—16. Only in Matt.

16. *Read*: viz. in Ps. viii. 3 [where the English version has “strength” instead of “praise;” but the Hebrew word may mean either, and most modern commentators take it there in the sense of “praise”].

17. *Into Bethany*: where he had friends (see note on Mark xi. 3). This is the close of the first day, according to the first Evangelist. Comp. notes on Mark xi. 11, 19.

Verses 18, 19 = Mark xi. 12—14.

**19.** The fig-tree falsely pretending to a life which it had not really (see note on Mark xi. 13), is the symbol of Israel, in which piety had become mere external show, had run to leaf while the fruit was looked for in vain. We have here the transformation, of Luke xiii. 6—9 into history, under the influence of Hos. ix. 10 and perhaps also of Luke xvii. 6.—*And presently* (i.e. immediately) *the fig-tree withered away*: According to Mark xi. 20, it was not found withered until the next day.

Verses 20—22 = Mark xi. 20—24.

Verses 23—27 = Mark xi. 27—33.

**23.** *These things*: i.e. the last things which had happened the day before, according to ver. 14 the miraculous cures. Different in Mark xi. 28.—*Who*: i.e. God or man? Jesus is required to make a declaration as to his Messianic claims.

**24.** This declaration Jesus refuses to give until the priests have first granted him a premise on which he intends to rest his claims, the divine mission of John the precursor (comp. iii. 11, 12).

**25, 26.** The authorities had simply let the Baptist do as he liked without coming to any decision about him.

Verses 28—31.

This parable is only found in Matthew, though connected with Luke xv. 11—32. The two sons, in the order in which they here appear, represent on the one hand the sinful people yielding at last to the call to repentance, and on the other hand the model Jews promising nothing but holiness, and performing nothing but an outward show of righteousness. But they were early taken as types of heathenism and Judaism, and, as the divine commission was given to the Jews first, the order was accordingly inverted, the son who promised and then failed in his obedience being put first. [In the Vatican MS., where this inverted order appears, we find “the latter” instead of “the first” in ver. 31.]

**32.** *In the way of righteousness*: i.e. requiring strict observance of the law. Jesus just touches upon the contrast more fully developed in xi. 18, 19.—*Repented not afterward*: confirmation of what is assumed in ver. 25.

Verses 33—46 = Mark xii. 1—12.

**33.** *Vineyard*: symbol of Israel, after Is. v. 1, 2. The tower

served for the watchman of the vineyard. The owner let the vineyard to husbandmen for a payment in kind, probably a tithe of the produce.

**34.** *The fruits of it*: more exactly in Mark xii. 2 = Luke xx. 10. Fruit is the symbol of willing fulfilment of duty. Comp. iii. 8.

**34—36.** The two series of servants represent the prophets, which were distinguished as “earlier” and “later.”

**38.** *His inheritance*: the rich possession of the Messiah, according to Gen. xv. 2 sqq., Ps. ii. 8.

**39.** *Cast him out of the vineyard and slew him*: on the meaning of this, comp. Heb. xiii. 12.

**42.** Ps. cxviii. 22, 23, refers originally to the nation of Israel, lightly esteemed, yet raised by God to high importance. The side walls meet and rest upon the corner-stone. It supports the whole house.

**43.** Only in Matt. The meaning of the parable.

**44.** After Is. viii. 14, 15; Jer. vi. 21; Dan. ii. 34, 35. It is under all circumstances dangerous to come in contact with this stone. People knock against it when it lies on the ground; but if it rolls down from above, it crushes their heads.

## CHAPTER xxii.

### Verses 1—14.

This passage = Luke xiv. 16—24, increased by the addition of a new parable (11—14). The whole passage 1—14 is an interpolation, as ver. 15 takes up again the subject of xxi. 46.

**4.** *Other servants*: as in xxi. 34—36. The words of the king are an imitation of Prov. ix. 2.

**7.** Allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem.

**9.** The calling of the Gentiles.

**10.** *Both bad and good*: the time of the conversion of the masses (comp. ver. 14).

**11.** *Wedding garment*: the garment, which here makes its appearance, signifies morals and conduct of life. He who is so unexpectedly introduced into the royal palace, without ever having deserved such an honour, should have sufficient tact and delicacy not to insult the royal invitation by the rudeness of his heathen customs.

Verses 15—22 = Mark xii. 13—17.

**16.** *Herodians*: these were the adherents of the royal house. The Pharisees, on the other hand, were adherents of the popular government. Here, however, they combine against the common danger.

**17.** *Tribute unto Cesar or not*: the great question of the day for all enthusiastic dreamers of liberty in Judea. Judas of Galilee had already answered it in the negative, and thereby called down upon himself the fate which the Pharisees, hoping for a similar answer, are now trying to prepare for Jesus. Comp. Luke xx. 20; Acts v. 37. Hence the appeal to his courage, ver. 16.

**19.** *A penny*: a denarius; the amount of the universal poll-tax, the most keenly felt by the people, and the most hateful to them.

**20.** The emperors had coins struck for the Jews without a head on them, the idolized heads of the emperors being an abomination to them. But in so great a concourse of foreigners as there was at the festival, there must have been numbers of coins with the head in circulation. Those who bring the coin hope at the same time to rouse the indignation of the Messiah against the foreign government by the sight of one of these.

**21.** The prevailing coinage is the representative sign of the government which is practically acknowledged. In giving the emperor the coin which bears his image, they do but return to him his own property. But duty to God still remains by the side of this complete and undisturbed. Comp. John xviii. 36.

Verses 23—33 = Mark xii. 18—27.

**23.** *No resurrection*: comp. note on iii. 7 They know beforehand that the Galilean teacher is on the side of the popular belief.

**24.** *Marry*: properly, “marry as a brother-in-law.” Such marriage to a brother-in-law (levirate marriage) is required by Deut. xxv. 5.—*Seed*: i.e. “descendants.”

**30.** Refers to the “power of God” in ver. 29, which is able to do what is spoken of in greater detail in 1 Cor. xv. 35—50.

**31.** Refers to “the Scriptures” in ver. 29, viz. Exod. iii. 6, 13, 15, 16. God cannot appeal to dead names, nor set up tombstones as monuments of His promises.

**33** = Mark xi. 18.

Verses 34—40 = Mark xii. 28—34.

**36.** Among the schoolmen of that age, the question had arisen of the distinction between the great and small, easy and difficult, weighty and unweighty, in the law. Inasmuch as the Pharisees regarded their “precepts” and “traditions” as more important than the law, they might be said to “tempt” him (ver. 35). Comp. notes on xv. 2, 5.

**37.** From Deut. vi. 5.

**39.** From Levit. xix. 18. See explanation of it, vii. 12.

**40.** *Hang*: as on hinges.

Verses 41—46 = Mark xii. 35—37.

**41.** Seeing the dejection of his opponents, Jesus himself comes forward to the attack.

**42.** See note on i. 1.

**43, 44.** To the learning of the scribes, according to which the Messiah is descended from David, Jesus opposes the utterance of David himself, who must have known best of all. He quotes the first verse of Ps. ci., which was ascribed to David.

**45.** If the Messiah stands as high above David as the master above the servant, how can his rank and position be expressed by saying, as incompetent scripturalism affirms, that he is his son? In other cases the ancestor is above his descendants, Abraham above the people that has sprung from him.

**46.** After Mark xii. 34. The answer to the question is, that Jesus makes his rank as Messiah entirely independent of the descent from David. This descent itself, moreover, would be very difficult to prove.

#### CHAPTER xxiii.

Verses 1—7 = Mark xii. 38—40.

**1.** *To the multitude and to his disciples*: The discourse which follows is really composed of very different materials. Some is addressed to the people, some to the disciples, and some is addressed directly to his opponents.

**2, 3.** Only in Matt. Those who have placed themselves in Moses’ seat, i.e. made themselves his successors, have themselves assumed the position of teachers; nevertheless, Jesus recognizes them as allowed by God in the same way as the Roman government is (xxii. 20, 21).

**4.** *They bind*: i.e. they make up out of separate parts; their system of morals is a laboriously compounded mixture.

**5.** Only in Matt. *To be seen*: comp. vi. 1—5.—*Phylacteries*: strips of parchment, with Deut. xi. 13—22, vi. 4—10, Exod. xiii. 1—17, written on them, called by the Jews *Tephillin*, and worn, in accordance with Exod. xiii. 9, Deut. vi. 8, on the head and on the heart. They were the objects of the greatest superstition, like amulets in our own time.—*Borders*: see note on ix. 20. [The Greek word is the same which is there translated “hem.”]

**7.** *Rabbi*: i.e. “my master!” a usual expression of respect in addressing the scribes.

Verses 8—11. Only in Matt.

**9.** *Father*: in the metaphorical sense in which the word is used of the highest spiritual regard.

**11** = xx. 26, 27.

Verses 13—36.

**13.** *Woe unto you, scribes*: as in Is. x. 1. The first of seven denunciations of woe.

**14.** This verse is not found here in the oldest MSS., and has been introduced from Mark xii. 40 = Luke xx. 47.—*Devour widows' houses* = after Ezek. xxii. 25. They make pious women pay them handsomely as their intercessors and spiritual advisers.

**15—22.** Only in Matt. Second and third woes.

**15.** While the Pharisees fell so unscrupulously short of their duty to their own nation, they were immensely zealous in their labours to convert the heathen. And then those who were thus gained outdid their teachers, if possible, in perversity.

**16.** *Gold*: a mercenary nature knows well how to value the gilding.

**22.** Repetition from v. 34.

**23—36** = Luke xi. 39—51.

**23.** *Mint and anise and cummin*: the smallest produce of the land; while, according to Levit. xxvii. 30, Numb. xviii. 12, Deut. xii. 6, xiv. 22, 23, only corn, oil, must [i.e. new wine; A.V “wine”], and fruits, were liable to tithe.

**24.** Only in Matt. The wine was strained, in order that not even the smallest unclean animal might be swallowed with it. [*Strain at*: should be, “strain out.”] The meaning is, Ye who

are over-scrupulous in trifles, and at the same time “swallow” “the weightier matters of the law” (23), i.e. neglect the simplest duties to your neighbours.

**25.** *Extortion and excess*: The gains of the deception which they practise upon pious enthusiasts (see note on ver. 14) supply their tables (cup and platter).

**26.** *That the outside of them may be clean also*: If the contents are rightly come by, that makes the dish cleaner than washing and scouring can make it. Taken differently in Luke xi. 40, 41.

**27.** *Whited sepulchres*: The reason why the sepulchres were whitened on the 15th of Adar with slaked lime, appears more correctly from Luke xi. 44.

**28.** Only in Matt.

**29.** To this day the so-called “graves of the prophets” are shown on the Mount of Olives.

**30.** Only in Matt.

**32, 33.** Only in Matt. What the fathers have left incomplete of their ill deeds, that shall the sons supply (“fill up”). Comp. iii. 7

**34. I:** In the original passage it is God who speaks. See note on Luke xi. 49.

**35. Abel**: The first murder, according to Gen. iv. 8.—*Zacharias, son of Barachias*: This might mean the priest whom Joash caused to be stoned in the forecourt of the temple (2 Chron. xxiv. 21); the last murder of a servant of God, mentioned in the Old Testament, as the Chronicles stand last according to the Jewish arrangement of the books. But the father of this Zachariah was named Jehoiada. There is probably some confusion between him and the prophet Zachariah, who is called son of Barachia (Zech. i. 1), unless indeed the whole passage is a later addition, and refers to the terrible end which the pious Zachariah, son of Baruch, met with in the temple at the hands of the zealots two years before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans (see note on Luke vi. 15).

Verses 37—39 = Luke xiii. 34, 35.

**37** *Thy children*: according to Gal. iv. 25, all Israel.—*Under her wings*: after Is. xxxi. 5, Ps. xxxvi. 8.—*And ye would not*: after Is. xxviii. 12.

**38.** *Desolate*: The genuineness of this word here, and in Luke xiii. 35, is very doubtful. If we omit it, we must translate, “Your house will be forsaken (i.e. by God, after Is. lxii. 12) for you (i.e. to your hurt).” Contrast to Deut. xi. 12.

**39.** *Till ye shall say, &c.*: i.e. till ye acknowledge me as the Messiah (see notes on xi. 3, xxi. 9).

#### CHAPTER XXIV.

Verses 1—42 = Mark xiii. 1—37

**1.** *Buildings*: The temple proper, together with its courts, terraces, outer walls, and porticos.

**2.** *See ye not*: In contrast to the disciples, Jesus has eyes only for the dark fate that draws near.—*Thrown down*: after 2 Kings xxv. 13, Mich. iii. 12 = Jer. xxvi. 18. According to Matt. xxvi. 61, Acts vi. 14, Jesus must have proclaimed the judgment of God upon the temple, which was actually destroyed by fire in August of the year 70 A.D.

**3.** *Thy coming*: i.e. thy second coming to judgment (see note on xvi. 21). This second object of inquiry is wanting in Mark xiii. 4 = Luke xxi. 7, and is taken from the contents of the speech which follows.

Verses 4—34.

A stray leaf (see note on ver. 15), from the period of the Jewish war, which has been inserted in the continuous narrative of the Gospels, and which probably is substantially the same as the prophecy in consequence of which the Christians, according to the testimony of Eusebius, left Jerusalem two years before its fall and migrated to Pella. In that case, it is the oldest Christian “Revelation,” artistically divided into three chief divisions (4—14, 15—28, 29—34), in each of which we have first a general description of the events which will occur, followed by exhortations and commands of Jesus to Christendom which were supplied by tradition (9 sqq., 23 sqq., 32 sqq.).

**4—14.** “The beginning of sorrows,” first the historical foreground, and then the special lot of the Christian community.

**5.** This only actually occurred in the form found in Acts v. 36, xxi. 38. Bar-Chochba appeared as the Messiah (130—135 A.D.).

**6.** *Wars and rumours of wars*: near at hand (Herod Antipas

and Aretas) and distant (on the frontiers of the kingdom).—*The end*: to be explained in the same way as ver. 14.

7. The Parthian wars had broken out again in the year 58, and in addition to these came, as preludes to the other troubles, the Jewish rebellion against Nero, Vespasian's expedition against Judea, and the quarrels of the Jewish factions.—*Famines and pestilences and earthquakes*: to be explained in the same way as Rev. vi. 4—8, 12. Especially it refers to the great famine under Claudius (Acts xi. 28) and Nero, and the earthquakes of the Jordan valley, but also to those in Asia Minor (Laodicea, in the year 61).

8. *Sorrows*: The times of want and trouble, from which at last deliverance and the Messiah were to spring, were called “sorrows of the Messiah” (from Hos. xiii. 13; Micah iv. 9, 10, v. 2; Is. lxvi. 7—9). As the “beginning” of them, appear here terrible natural phenomena and events of world-wide importance beyond the borders of Israel.

9, 10. Repetition from x. 21, 22.

9. *Hated of all nations*: As the Jews had formerly been hated by the Gentiles (comp. note on v. 43), so should the Christians be both by Jews and Gentiles.

10. Desertion and treachery in the community itself.

11. Comp. Acts viii. 9—11.

12. Only in Matt.—*Iniquity*: properly, “neglect of the law” (comp. v. 18).—*The love of many shall wax cold*: as in Ephesus, according to Rev. ii. 4.

13. *Saved*: see note on ver. 22.

14. Insertion of a period of indefinite length, in consequence of the experience of the conversion of the Gentiles, in contradiction to vv. 22, 34, and also to x. 23.—*The end*: the judgment upon the temple and the people, together with the end of the world immediately connected with it (ver. 29).

15—28. The divine judgment in Judea and the flight of the community.

15. Quotation from Dan. ix. 27, xii. 11, which had already been applied (1 Macc. i. 54, vi. 7) to the altar of Olympian Zeus which Antiochus Epiphanes caused to be placed upon the altar of burnt-offering. The original prophecy probably feared some similar proceeding on the part of the Romans, which appeared

quite credible after what Caligula had attempted. On the other hand, it was interpreted later of the experiences of the year 70 (see note on Luke xxi. 20). There is nothing here about any destruction of the city or temple, and in the greater “Revelation” we find the very opposite (Rev. xi. 1—13).—*Whoso recealeth*: a plain indication that this prophecy was originally written and not spoken.

**16.** *Into the mountains*: from Ezek. vii. 16. As a matter of fact, the Christians did not flee into the mountains of Judea, but across the Jordan.

**17.** *Not come down*: but flee away over the flat roofs. Hastiest flight from the scene of judgment, because of Ezek. vii. 15.

**20.** *Neither on the Sabbath-day*: consistent with v. 18, but not with xii. 2, 5, 10—12.

**22.** *Saved*: i.e. brought safely through the troubles here described into the Messianic kingdom. Lest even the elect should perish at last, the days are shortened (Dan. ix. 27).

**23.** The excitement of the fugitives and the ferment of the times bring on new temptations.

**24.** Comp. Rev. xiii. 11—17.

**26.** *In the desert*: An example is afforded by Acts xxi. 38.

**28.** After Job xxxix. 30, Hab. i. 8. See note on Luke xvii. 37.

### Verses 29—42.

“The end,” i.e. the universal transformation which is to take place at the second coming of Christ, after the judgment upon the temple and the people.

**29.** After Is. xiii. 10, xxxiv. 4; Ezek. xxxii. 7; Joel ii. 10, iii. 3; and probably Rev. vi. 12—14.

**30.** *Sign of the Son of Man*: the appearance of a brilliant light as the sign of his coming. The mourning tribes of the earth, from Zech. xii. 10, and probably Rev. i. 7. The Son of Man in the clouds, from Dan. vii. 13 (see also Acts i. 9, 11).

**31.** *Send his angels*: as in xiii. 41.—*A trumpet*: comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22, 1 Thess. iv. 16.—*From the four winds*: comp. Luke xiii. 29.

**32.** *Is yet tender*: “is now becoming tender” [or more exactly, “has now become tender”]. Fruit begins to appear on the fig-tree about Easter, and then the leaves follow (see note on Mark xi. 13).

**34.** *This generation*: It is usual to reckon three generations to the century.

**35.** *My words*: This refers in the first place to the present prophecy. After Is. xl. 8, li. 6.

**36.** *Not the angels of heaven*: The oldest MSS. add, “neither the Son,” as in Mark xiii. 32.

**37—39.** See Gen. vi. 2—7, 11—13, vii. 1, 5 sqq.

**40, 41.** Into how close contact shall salvation and destruction come then, wherever any one is overtaken by the judgment!

**41** = Luke xvii. 35. It was the duty of the maid-servants to turn the hand-mills.

Verses 43—51. Only in Matt.

A full and detailed final exhortation in place of Mark xiii. 33—37, and another form of what appears in Luke xii. 39—46.

**43.** *The thief*: from Joel ii. 9.

**51.** *Cut him asunder*: cut him into two pieces, saw him in two.

## CHAPTER XXV.

Verses 1—13. Only in Matt.

A parable, originating in Luke xii. 35, 36, from the time of the Evangelist himself, when Christendom was already beginning to be weary and drowsy.

**1.** *Ten virgins*: As in 2 Cor. xi. 2, Eph. v. 25, the church is the bride, so the separate congregations are the bridesmaids. Comp. Judges xiv. 11; Song of Sol. iii. 11.—*Went forth*: to the bride’s house. Thither the wedding is transferred, for the sake of the subject here represented (Christ coming down to his church); but see 1 Macc. ix. 37 sqq., Tobit xi. 21.

**8.** *Are gone out*: “are going out.”

**13** = Mark xiii. 33, 35.

Verses 14—30.

Amplification of Mark xiii. 34. Comp. Luke xix. 11—27

**15.** *Five talents*: £1200.—*According to his several ability*: according to his capability in business affairs and money-making.

**21.** *Into the joy of thy Lord*: into the blessedness in which he rejoices.

**25, 26.** Assuming the austerity and love of money on the part

of the master, the servant should have made the more unceasing exertions to satisfy his requirements.

**Verses 31—46.** Only in Matt.

A final picture from the same hand as xiii. 36—43, elaborating the description of the separation there brought into view. The spread of Christianity over the whole earth is now assumed.

**32.** *All nations*: according to vv. 40, 45, the Christians themselves stand by the throne and are not included in the judgment. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 2.—*Goats*: they were considered worthless animals. Comp. Luke xv. 29.

**33.** *Right*: i.e. on the side of good omen. Comp. Mark xvi. 5, Luke i. 11. The description is based upon Ezek xxxiv. 17.

**34.** *King*: God is spoken of as King in v. 35, xxii. 2 sqq., and as Judge, x. 32, 33. Hence the name is here, at a later time, transferred to Christ as representative of God.

**35.** *Ye took me in*: lit. “Ye brought me together;” i.e. together with your own family, brought me into your domestic circle. Based upon Is. lviii. 7, Ezek. xviii. 7.

**36.** *In prison*: comp. Rev. ii. 10, xiii. 10, Heb. x. 34.

**40.** *One of the least*: see x. 42, xviii. 6. The whole is an amplification of x. 40—42. Comp. also Prov. xix. 17.

**41.** Amplification of vii. 23.

**46.** Amplification of xvi. 27, and also after Dan. xii. 2.

## CHAPTER xxvi.

**Verses 1—5 =** Mark xiv. 1, 2.

**2.** *After two days*: so that one whole day intervenes.—*The passover*: our Easter (the spring festival of the Teutonic goddess Ostara). The Jewish passover was likewise a spring festival (the beginning of the harvest); but the memory of the deliverance from Egypt was also united with it. The time here meant is the beginning of the feast on the 15th of Nisan (beginning of April), on which day all Israelites had properly to present themselves in the temple and to eat their paschal lamb.

**3.** Combination of the chief priests, who were Sadducees, with the popular party of the zealots for the law. On Caiaphas, see note on Luke iii. 2.

**5.** They want to wait till the people who are assembled for

the feast have dispersed again, for fear of the Galilean followers of Jesus. The occurrence which interferes with this plan follows in vv. 14, 15.

Verses 6—13 = Mark xiv. 3—9.

6. *The leper*: Jesus' host is called a leper because he had formerly been one.

7. *Box* should be “bottle” or “vase.”—*Ointment*: properly “spikenard,” a very fragrant oil from India.

12. *For my burial*: Corpses were embalmed. Hence he points out that this act of love is an unconscious farewell, a work of love and respect performed upon his body beforehand. This was the evening before the “night in which he was betrayed.”

Verses 14—16 = Mark xiv. 10, 11.

15. *Deliver him unto you*: i.e. give you an opportunity of laying hold of him secretly, which would not be easy with Jerusalem and the whole neighbourhood so crowded as they then were with visitors come up to the festival.—*They covenanted with him for*: properly, “they weighed for him.” The custom of weighing gold had certainly long been obsolete, but the passage, Zech. xi. 12, which, according to xxvii. 9, 10, was then fulfilled, required it. Hence also the *thirty pieces of silver*, according to Exod xxi. 32 the price of a slave, about £3. 15s.

Verses 17—19 = Mark xiv. 12—16.

17. *On the first day of the feast of unleavened bread*: Originally only the days from 15th to 21st of Nisan belonged to the “feast of unleavened bread.” But just as the whole festival which began with the slaughter of the paschal lamb on the 14th of Nisan was called the passover, so conversely the name “feast of unleavened bread” was extended so as to include the 14th as the first day. The lamb had to be slaughtered before sunset of this day (Exod. xii. 6).

18. *To such a man*: Too concise to be definite. Comp. Mark xiv. 13—15. Some appointment must have been made with a friend who was resident in Jerusalem.

Verses 20—29 = Mark xiv. 17—25.

23. On the basis of Exod. xii. 1—20, a formal usage had been established with regard to the paschal meal, in which we find, in

addition to the lamb, a broth in which bread and bitter herbs were dipped. This is probably “the dish.” Hence the saying here reported does not point out Judas individually, but only indicates that the traitor is one who is with them at the sacred meal. It is by the connection with ver. 25, only found in the first Gospel, that this is changed.

**25.** Only in Matt., and rests upon the supposition that Judas had, in ver. 23, put out his hand to the dish just at the same time as Jesus.

**26.** *Bread*: one of the cakes of unleavened bread (“mazzoth”).—*Blessed it*: “gave thanks” [more exactly, “offered a blessing”]. The custom was for the father of the household, whose place Jesus here takes, to say, “Blessed be God, who bringeth bread out of the earth!”—*This is my body*: inasmuch as it will be broken like the bread. This is known as “Jesus’ last parable.”

**27.** *Cup*: During the paschal meal various cups were passed round. This is probably the third, which was called “the cup of blessing” (1 Cor. x. 16). In taking it, the blessing was uttered, “Blessed be God, who hath created the fruit of the vine.”

**28.** *This*: i.e. red wine mixed with water, with which the cup which Jesus took up from the table was filled. In this, Jesus sees in the solemnity of this last moment the blood of the sacrifice of the covenant, by the sprinkling of which the old covenant had formerly been made upon Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 8); after this comes a new covenant of grace and forgiveness (Jer. xxxi. 33, 34). As each one drinks the wine, so also—and what a comfort is the thought in this bitter hour of separation!—so also shall his blood, shed in his violent death, flow for the welfare of many, who as his followers become (what they never were as disciples of Moses) God’s children. Thus they become a new people, in a new covenant (testament) with the Father. Hence the “new testament,” Luke xxii. 20.—*The new testament*, should be “the covenant.”—*Is shed*: “is being shed.”—*For the remission of sins*: comp. Jer. xxxi. 34, Is. xxxiii. 24.

**29.** *This fruit of the vine*: an expression taken from the ceremony of the Easter festival (see note on ver. 27).—*New*: in the renovation of the world, xix. 18, comp. Is. xxv. 6.

Verses 30—35 = Mark xiv. 26—31.

**30.** *An hymn*: “the hymn of praise,” probably Pss. cxv.—cxviii.

**31.** *Be offended because of me*: have occasion to be disconcerted in your belief in me. Quotation from Zech. xiii. 7, in support of this.

**32.** Anticipation of xxviii. 7, 16; but it breaks the connection here.

Verses 36—46 = Mark xiv. 32—42.

**36.** *Gethsemane*: (i.e. oil-press) lay on the Mount of Olives. The words of Jesus recall Gen. xxii. 5, Exod. xxiv. 14.

**37.** He desires to be alone and yet not entirely alone.

**38.** The words recall Ps. xlvi. 7, 11.

**39.** *Cup*: comp. xx. 22. Here Jesus still seems to see before him the cup of the last supper, and of the “hymn,” Ps. cxvi. 13.

**41.** *The flesh*: the physical nature of the human soul is overcome by the impressions which rush overpoweringly upon it.

**42.** After vi. 10.

**44.** Only in Matt., to bring out the number of three acts of prayer (see p. 44).

Verses 47—56 = Mark xiv. 43—50.

**47.** Judas had separated himself from the company when they set out on their walk by night, to get the priests to put the temple guard at his service, and to deliver up his Master to them before daybreak.

**49.** Recalls 2 Sam. xx. 9, 10.

**52—54.** Only in Matt.

**52.** The saying about the sword, from Rev. xiii. 10.

**53.** *Twelve legions*: instead of the twelve disciples.

**54.** *The scriptures*: probably Is. lili., Pss. xxii. lxix., and also cxviii. 22 (comp. Matt. xxi. 42).

Verses 57—68 = Mark xiv. 53—65.

**57** The council was at once hastily called together in the night. A third part was sufficient to make its determination valid.

**58.** *Palace*: here means the inner court.

**59.** *False*: The high council only wanted now to invent some legal ground for their proceedings. The sentence of death was already determined upon. Comp. Ps. xxvii. 12.

**61.** They thought that they were producing something decisive when they appealed to an insulting speech about the temple. See note on xxiv. 2.—*In three days*: i.e. in the shortest time. See note on Mark xiv. 58.

**63.** *I adjure thee*: i.e. I require a declaration on oath (Jos. vii. 19; 1 Kings xxii. 16); a declaration upon the question at issue between Jesus and the high-priesthood, whether he was the Messiah or not. See note on ii. 15.

**64.** *Hereafter*: “from this time forth.” The blasphemy of Jesus’ acknowledgment that he was the Messiah really lay in the miserable appearance which he presented at the time, diametrically opposed to all the popular Messianic ideas. Hence he refers them to the immediate future (“from this time forth,” see note on xxiv. 34), when they shall perceive the signs which, according to Ps. cx. 1 (see note on xxii. 43, 44) and Dan. vii. 13 (see note on xxiv. 30), declare the Messiah.

**65.** *Rent his clothes*: as a sign of the deepest indignation. 2 Kings xviii. 37.

**66.** The penalty for blasphemy was death (Levit. xxiv. 16); and it was a case of blasphemy which was now laid before them, for the honour of God was directly concerned in the Messianic question. See Jer. xxvi. 11.

**67.** As soon as he is condemned their hatred breaks out. Comp. Micah iv. 14; Is. l. 6, liii. 3—5; 1 Kings xxii. 24.

**68.** It is understood that they covered his face (Mark xiv. 65 = Luke xxii. 64).

Verses 69—75 = Mark xiv. 66—72.

**71.** *Another*: according to Mark xiv. 69, it was the same who informed the servants standing by of her discovery.

**73.** The Galileans had a broad provincial pronunciation.

**74.** *Then began he to curse*: i.e. to curse himself if he lied.

## CHAPTER xxvii.

Verses 1, 2 = Mark xv. 1.

**1.** *When the morning was come*: The work of the night, in order that it might seem legal, required supplementing by further proceedings, as, according to Jewish usage, sentence of death could only be pronounced by day. Hence, immediately upon the rising

of the sun, the council, which had meanwhile increased to its full number, confirms the resolution which had already been arrived at. [Luther renders this verse, “But in the morning all the high-priests and the elders of the people held a council upon Jesus that they might put him to death,” which Holtzmann accepts, and explains as above; but De Wette says, ‘After they had passed sentence of death (xxvi. 66), they took counsel as to the best way of carrying it out.’]

**2. Governor:** He usually resided at Cæsarea, but it was his custom to come to Jerusalem at the time of the passover. He was now required by them because, from the time of the expulsion of Archelaus, the Jews had lost the right of deciding capital cases. See note on Luke iii. 1.

### Verses 3—10. Only in Matt.

**5.** The traitor’s end, after 2 Sam. xvii. 23.

**6.** *It is not lawful*: Deut. xxiii. 19. Concerning a later tradition, see note on Acts i. 18.

**8. The field of blood**: so Acts i. 19.

**9, 10.** This whole legend springs simply from Zech. xi. 12, 13 (here erroneously ascribed to Jeremiah, on account of the purchase of the field, Jer. xxxii. 6—15, and the “house of the potter,” Jer. xviii. 2, 3). The prophet resigns his office as shepherd over Ephraim: “And they weighed as my wages thirty pieces of silver; and the Lord said unto me, Cast into the treasury the magnificent price at which I have been valued by them. So I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them in the house of God into the treasury.” We find these verses here in a translation which is full of misunderstandings. Especially the Evangelist has rendered “el hajozar” (into the treasury) as if it were “el hajozer” (to the potter), and consequently speaks afterwards not only of the “field of blood,” but also of the “potter’s field.”

### Verses 11—14 = Mark xv. 2—5.

**11.** The question shows us the form of the charge made by the Jews, viz. that in laying claim to the position of Messiah Jesus had at the same time declared war against the existing order of government, and especially against the supremacy of Rome. The Messianic title is cunningly transformed into “Son

of God” before the Jewish council, and into “King” before the Gentile judge.

**12—14.** Jesus submits to the lot that is prepared for him. Comp. also Is. liii. 7 = Acts viii. 32.

Verses 15—23 = Mark xviii. 6—14.

**15.** *At that feast*: the conception of the passover had special reference to sparing and showing favour, Exod. xii. 27. [The Greek is literally “at feast,” and is taken by many commentators to mean “at each feast,” and rendered by Lightfoot “at feast-time.”]

**16.** *Barabbas*: The name means “son of the father,” i.e. of the Rabbi (see note on xxiii. 9), so that he must have been the son of some well-known scribe. See note on Luke xiii. 1. If we can trust some of the ancient authorities, his proper name was Jesus.

**17.** According to this verse, it is Pilate himself who gives the people the choice, which, however, was probably due rather to circumstances than to his special wish (see note on Mark xv. 11).

**18.** *For envy*: of his popularity among the people.

**19.** Only in Matt.

Verses 24, 25. Only in Matt.

Additions made by tradition; the first being a Jewish symbolic action, Deut. xxi. 6, 7.

Verses 26—30 = Mark xv. 15—19.

**26.** Scourging, which was itself often fatal, was the standing prelude to the Roman punishment of crucifixion.

**27.** *The soldiers*: As the sentence of death could only be passed by the Romans, so it could only be executed by them.—*Common hall*: “judgment hall” [prætorium, i.e. the governor’s quarters]; here the palace of king Herod, in which Pilate resided.—*Band*: the governor’s body-guard.

**28.** *A scarlet robe*: a red soldier’s mantle, called a sagum.

**29.** The Gentile soldiers gratify their feelings of contempt for the Jews by dressing him in this mock royal robe.

Verses 31, 32 = Mark xv. 20, 21.

**31.** *They took the robe off from him*: Public mockery of Judaism was strictly forbidden to the Roman soldiers.

**32.** *Out*: The execution had to take place outside the city (see Levit. xxiv. 14). But besides this, the Romans usually crucified by the side of the highway for the sake of the greatest possible publicity.—*Cyrene*: in Libya. There were many Jews settled there. Acts vi. 9.—*Compelled*: comp. note on v. 41.—*His cross*: see note on xvi. 24.

Verses 33—44 = Mark xv. 22—32.

**33.** *Place of a skull*: so called from the rounded form of the bare hill (“Mount Calvary”).

**34.** *Vinegar*: the oldest MSS. read “wine.” The Jews were accustomed to give soporific drinks to those about to be executed in order to dull their sensations.—*With gall*: probably means wormwood, but the word gall is chosen because of Ps. lxix. 22.

**35.** The clothes of those who were crucified fell to the lot of the soldiers who were appointed to the hangman’s office. The second half of this verse, from *that it might* to the end, with the quotation from Ps. xxii. 18, is not authentic, and has been introduced from John xix. 24.

**36.** Four soldiers to each cross, who answered with their own lives for the execution of the death warrant.

**37.** It was the Roman custom for such an inscription to be carried before the criminal as he walked to the place of execution.

**39.** After Ps. xxii. 7.

**40.** See xxvi. 61.

**43.** Only in Matt. After Ps. xxii. 8.

Verses 45—53 = Mark xv. 33—38.

**45.** Nature mourns for the dead, as is to be expected in a popular representation of such overwhelming events.

**46.** *About the ninth hour*: three o’clock in the afternoon.—The last words, as he faints away, like so much that has preceded, belong to the same Psalm (Ps. xxii. 1) that has had so great an influence upon the form of the whole narrative (see notes to vv. 35, 39, 43). Comp. especially Ps. xxii. 16. The words are here given in Aramaic on account of the following verse.

**47.** *Elias*: as precursor and restorer. Comp. xvii. 11.

**48.** *Vinegar*: sour wine such as the Roman soldiers were accustomed to carry with them on the march. But the misunderstanding in ver. 47, which is in any case suspicious, could

not possibly have arisen in the minds of Roman soldiers to whom “Eli” and Elias were equally unknown.—*On a reed*. The crosses were not very high.—*Gave him to drink*: Thirst is one of the special pangs of the torture of the cross. What they had heard must have been a cry of pain.

51. In the Gospel of the Hebrews, the lintel of the temple-door falls to the ground. These are symbolic representations of the fall of the ancient sanctuaries; perhaps also (as the veil covered the holy of holies, the dwelling-place of God) representations of the thought contained in Rom. v. 2, Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12.

52. Only in Matt. A later legend, resting, like Luke xxiii. 43, on the tendency, which had then arisen, to the idea afterwards expressed in the words of the creed, “he descended into hell” (comp. Eph. iv. 9, 1 Pet. iii. 19).

53. *After his resurrection*: because he must still be “the first fruits of them that slept” (1 Cor. xv. 20).

#### Verses 54—61 = Mark xv. 39—47

54. *The centurion*: see note on viii. 5. He was obliged to remain all the time upon the spot. There is a different explanation of his words in Mark xv. 39.

55. See Luke viii. 2, 3.

56. *Magdalene*: called after the name of her home to distinguish her from other women of the name of Mary. See note on xv. 39; Luke viii. 2.—*The mother of Zebedee’s children*: called Salome in Mark xv. 40.

57. *Arimathaea*: the ancient Ramathaim, 1 Sam. i. 1.

58. Usually the Romans let the bodies of those who were crucified rot away on the cross. Sometimes, however, they gave them up to their friends for a sum of money. On this occasion, moreover, they would have some regard to the very different custom of the Jews (Deut. xxi. 23).

60. Jerusalem is still surrounded by such rock sepulchres and caves. See note on xxiii. 29.

61. *The other Mary*: comp. ver. 56. Not the mother of Jesus.

#### Verses 62—66. Only in Matt.

62. *The day of the preparation*: Friday, because it was the day on which preparation was made for the Sabbath.

**63.** Impossible. See note on xvi. 21.

**64.** Hence we see that this narrative is only introduced in order to destroy the point of the Jewish assertion, directed against the belief in the resurrection, that the disciples had stolen the corpse. If Jesus had really promised that he should rise again on the third day, it follows from the whole account of the proceedings which we possess, that not even the disciples who fled (xxvi. 56) and were sad (Luke xxiv. 17 sqq.), nor the women, who intended to embalm the body (Mark xvi. 1), could have taken the saying seriously. And in the sequel the women do not act as if there were any guard before the grave (xxviii. 1), and are only anxious about the stone (Mark xvi. 3).

[**65.** *Ye have a watch*: perhaps, “take a watch,” which is Luther’s translation, and is accepted by Prof. Holtzmann without comment; but in any case the meaning is not that they had already soldiers at their command, but that their request is granted there and then.]

**66.** *Sealing*: after Dan. vi. 17. A cord running across the entrance to the grave was fastened at both ends with sealing-earth.

### CHAPTER xxviii.

Verses 1—8 = Mark xvi. 1—8.

Paul, who gives the earliest account in 1 Cor. xv. 4—8; and has the first word upon the whole question of the resurrection, knows nothing of this scene.

**1.** *In the end*, &c. should be “But after the Sabbath at the dawn of the first day of the week.”

**2—4.** These verses, which are only in Matt., are rendered necessary by xxvii. 62—66.

**6.** *He is not here*: the only words of the angel in which the three Evangelists agree.

**7.** Fulfilment of xxvi. 32.

Verses 9—20. Only in Matt.

**9, 10.** An independent, later tradition, coinciding in substance with the earlier one in vv. 5—8.

**11—15.** The conclusion of xxvii. 62—66, xxviii. 2—4.

**16.** *Into Galilee*: It is probably historically correct that the disciples who had fled (xxvi. 56) did not collect together again

until they reached Galilee. There Christianity was born a second time.

**18—20.** The oldest account (1 Cor. xv. 5—7) knows of nothing beyond visions. Here the arisen Jesus is heard speaking, and his words stand on the same level of ideal truth as in Rev. i. 8, 11, 17—20.

**18.** Repetition and climax of xi. 27.

**19.** *Teach*: lit. “make disciples of”—*All nations*: to be regarded in the same way as xxiv. 14, xxv. 32.—*In the name*: lit. “into the name,” i.e. so that those who are baptized enter into a living religious connection with the bearer of the name, while they acknowledge that the bearer of the name is what the name denotes: viz. that God is “Father,” that Jesus in relation to Him is “Son,” and that the Spirit that lives in the community is the “holy Spirit.” On the three-fold baptismal formula, see pp. 42 sq.

**20.** *With you*: repetition and climax from xviii. 20.

## THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK.

### CHAPTER i.

#### Verses 1—4.

In the original, these four verses form one sentence, of which John is the subject, with a parenthetical reference to passages in the prophets. Literally : (The preparatory) *beginning of the Gospel* of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, *was* (as it is written, &c.) *John*, who was baptizing in the wilderness, &c. In the second Gospel, the regular opening of the evangelical statement is preserved (comp. Acts i. 21, 22, x. 37), the introductory narrative and legends of the childhood, which we find in the first and third Gospels, being later additions.

**2.** *In the prophets*: Two prophets are actually quoted here ; first, Malachi (iii. 1), exactly as in Matt. xi. 10 = Luke vii. 27, and then (in ver. 3) Isaiah (xl. 3). Notwithstanding this, the oldest known reading is, “in the prophet Isaiah.”

Verses 3—6 = Matt. iii. 3—6 = Luke iii. 3—6.

**4.** *Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins*: a baptism which is the proper accompaniment of the change of spirit within (repentance), representing that change symbolically by immersion, the symbol of the entire disappearance of the previous disposition of the man. At the same time it was also to enable every one who thus testified to the spiritual change within, to secure actual forgiveness. (See note on Matt. iii. 6).

Verses 7, 8 = Matt. iii. 11 = Luke iii. 16.

Verses 9—11 = Matt. iii. 13, 16, 17 = Luke iii. 21, 22.

Verses 12, 13 = Matt. iv. 1, 2, 11 = Luke iv. 1, 2, 13.

**13.** *And was with the wild beasts*: a standing and very descriptive phrase for residence in the wilderness. Comp. 2 Macc. v. 27, “Judas withdrew himself into the wilderness, and lived in the mountains after the manner of beasts.”

Verses 14, 15 = Matt. iv. 12, 17 Luke iv. 14.

**14.** *The Gospel of the kingdom of God:* see p. 33. From the very first, Jesus' preaching was a preaching of the kingdom, of the business he had in hand. It was not till later (viii. 31 and onwards) that he also spoke of his own person and office.

**15.** *The time is fulfilled:* In the irresistible consciousness of the greatest crisis that has ever fallen upon mankind. All that lies behind appears only as a preparation and introduction. Comp. Gal. iv. 4.

Verses 16—20 = Matt. iv. 18—22.

**16.** Here we see the geographical connection of events. Jesus coming from the south takes his way along the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, and comes to Capernaum (ver. 21), where the fishermen dwell, whom he calls as he sees them upon the shore.

Verses 21—28 = Luke iv. 31—37.

**21.** This Sabbath may be regarded as the opening day of Jesus' ministry. Consistently with the circumstances in which the second Gospel was composed (p. 46), the bare outline which we have hitherto found is now succeeded by a more detailed narrative.

**22.** The first great excitement is caused by the teaching of Jesus. What he says is original, incisive, altogether different from the traditional style of the schools, and never fails to make itself felt.

**24.** The demoniac speaks of himself in the plural, for the same reason as in v. 9. Comp. note on Matt. iv. 24, viii. 29.—*The holy one of God:* i.e. the one whom God has chosen out, consecrated, anointed, the Messiah.—[*Let alone:* in the Greek simply an exclamation = “Ha.” But Alford and Tischendorf omit, with some old MSS.]

**25.** The demoniac continues to cry after him, until Jesus, exalted by the triumphant sense of his own spiritual superiority, with a manifestation of evident annoyance, imperatively bids him be silent. He possesses an energy of will and faith, which he is able also to impart to others.

**26.** The convulsions of the epileptic.

**27** The final result arouses in Jesus himself the consciousness of this power which he possesses, and awakens belief in it in the

company round about him. This is the occasion for Jesus' exertion of power which henceforth developed itself in this direction, and which tradition especially delighted to deal with.

Verses 29—34 = Matt. viii. 14—17 = Luke iv. 38—41.

**29.** The house of Simon is henceforth the central point of the ministry in Capernaum (ii. 1 sq., iii. 20, ix. 33).

**33.** The house of Jesus is besieged—a trait which is peculiar to the second Gospel (comp. ii. 2, iii. 20).

**34.** *Suffered not the devils to speak*: so, iii. 12. In the same way, silence is imposed upon those who are healed upon other occasions (ver. 44, v. 43, vii. 36, viii. 26). Jesus hesitates to trust his cause to the deceptive channels of a belief in the miraculous aroused in the excited populace.

Verses 35—39 = Luke iv. 42—44.

**35.** In order that he may be alone and recover himself in prayer, he leaves the house secretly before daybreak.

**36.** *Followed after him*: literally, “pursued him,” as one who had escaped from them.

**37.** Early in the morning the inhabitants renewed the proceedings which they had begun the evening before (ver. 32).

**38.** *Came I forth*: better, “went I out.” His commission extends to all; hence he had been afraid of an uncharitable limitation of his ministry to one place, and had endeavoured to avoid it.

**39.** First discourse on the journey. Here his acts of healing are confined to the sphere of mental life, which was at that time the favourite, and the one in which there was most demand for them, and which at any rate has the surest historical basis. Unless we grant that striking results of this kind were produced, it is impossible to obtain any intelligible picture of the life of Jesus.

Verses 40—45 = Matt. viii. 1—4 = Luke v. 12—16.

**43.** It seems that the man, who was pronounced clean, was sent against his own will to Jerusalem, as directed by the law. There he must be pronounced clean by the priests before his company could be tolerated, especially in the house. See note on Matt. viii. 3.—*Straitly charged him*, should be “was angry with him.”

**45.** It appears from this verse that the course which the life

of Jesus was compelled to take in consequence of these acts of healing, was by no means welcome to him. He had intended to take up the work of a teacher in the cities. But it is precisely in the cities that he finds the part of a worker of miracles forced upon him, and from this he withdraws.—*Into the city*, should be “into a city.”

#### CHAPTER ii.

Verses 1—12 = Matt. ix. 1—8 = Luke v. 17—26.

**2.** Only in Mark. As the people fear that he will again only remain there a short time, they are desirous of availing themselves at once of his presence.

**4.** They ascend by the customary external staircase to the flat roof of the one-story house, take up the laths and tiles, and let down the bed, with the sick man, like a coffin.

**5.** *Thy sins be forgiven thee*: “Thy sins are forgiven thee.” [The MSS. have two readings here, one of which means strictly, “Thy sins are forgiven thee,” the other, “Thy sins are being forgiven thee;” so also in ver. 9.]

Verses 13—22 = Matt. ix. 9—17 = Luke v. 27—39.

**13.** Only in Mark.

**14.** *By* : viz. by the tax-office.—*Receipt of custom*: “tax-office.” —Levi: see p. 42.

**15.** Other tax-gatherers perceive the trust which is shown by the calling of one of their company, and so a friendly meal takes place in the house of Jesus, which scandalizes the pious people who are lying in wait for him.

**18.** According to this, the occasion for the following discussion was offered by the general custom of fasting of that time, to which the penitent disciples of John and the “pious” conformed most strictly.

Verses 23—28 = Matt. xii. 1—8 = Luke vi. 1—5.

**25.** *When he had need*: These words, which are peculiar to the second Gospel, go to the root of the matter. “Necessity has no law.”

**26.** *Abiathar*: a mistake for his father Abimelech.

**27.** Only in Mark. The Sabbath is a divine ordinance for the rest and refreshment of man. It is not an end in itself for which men should be enslaved and tortured.

**28.** From the fundamental superiority of man to the Sabbath, is derived the special right of the “Son of Man,” to whom pertain all rights and honours of mankind. In the phrase “Son of Man,” in addition to the national element (= Messiah, see note on Matt. viii. 20), there is also a general and truly human element. Jesus apprehends the former in the light of the latter.

### CHAPTER iii.

Verses 1—6 = Matt. xii. 9—14 = Luke vi. 6—11.

**3.** *Stand forth:* All is to be done quite openly before the spies who watch him.

**4.** *To do good:* This second narrative of the Sabbath runs parallel with the previous one. Here the same emancipating power is assigned to the work of love which is there assigned to the work of necessity (see note on ii. 25). The work is represented under the general conception of a morally good deed, the omission of which would be an evil deed. In order to present this still more vividly, he represents healing or not healing more generally as a saving of life or killing. In matters of life and death, even Jewish tradition allowed the neglect of the Sabbath.

**6.** *With the Herodians:* see note on Matt. xxii. 16.

Verses 7—19 = Matt. iv. 23—25, x. 1—4, xii. 15, 16 = Luke vi. 12—19.

**7.** *To the sea:* Here, as almost always in the Gospels, “the sea” means the Lake of Gennesareth. (Luke vi. 17 is an exception.)

**8.** An increasing concourse of people even from the furthest parts of Roman Palestine (Idumea), and from the Gentile maritime district between Palestine and the Mediterranean (Tyre and Sidon).

**9.** Only in Mark; comp. iv. 1.

**11.** Only in Mark. See note on Matt. iv. 24, viii. 29.

**13.** *A mountain,* should be “the mountain.” The mountain is here contrasted with the shore of the lake. Jesus withdraws again from the turbulent and urgent demands that are made upon him, and proceeds to separate a small permanent community from the ever-changing crowd of followers, in order that he may establish his work upon a lasting foundation.

**14.** The five (see i. 16, 19, ii. 14) are increased to twelve. (Comp. also Exod. xviii. 13—27)

**16.** *Peter*: i.e. “Rock” (in Aramaic, Kephas). The giving of this name is placed later in Matt. xvi. 18, and earlier in John i. 42.

**17.** *Boanerges*: This is the Aramaic form which is found in the Greek MSS. The Hebrew is Beneregesh.

Verses 20—30 = Matt. xii. 22—37 = Luke xi. 17—23.

**20, 21.** Only in Mark.

**20.** *And the multitude cometh together again*: comp. ver. 7, and note on i. 33.

**21.** *His friends*, should be “his relatives.”—*Went out*, should be “set out.”—His relatives, who in ver. 31 actually stand at the door, set out from Nazareth, and perhaps also (John ii. 12) from Cana, to find this member of the family whose unintelligible conduct has alienated him from them, and to withdraw him forcibly from his public life. The same suspicion of insanity was noised abroad in the case of Paul (2 Cor. v. 13). Here it forms an introduction to the much more culpable slander of the Pharisees in ver. 22.

**22.** *Down from Jerusalem*: either returning home from a feast, or sent from there (ver. 8) to watch the new prophet. Comp. vii. 1.

**23.** Only in Mark.

**29.** [*Eternal damnation*: Several of the best MSS. read, “shall be in danger of (or, as some translators take it, “shall lie under”) eternal sin.”]

**30.** See note on Matt. xii. 31.

Verses 31—35 = Matt. xii. 46—50 = Luke viii. 19—21.

The relatives mentioned in 21 (the connection does not appear till we reach this verse) stand without, on account of the entrance being choked by the multitude, and cause their presence to be announced; but Jesus, who knows their intention, rejects them as not kin to him in spirit. We have here the companion picture to vi. 1—4.

#### CHAPTER iv.

Verses 1—34 = Matt. xviii. 1—34 = Luke viii. 4—18.

**10.** *Asked of him the parable*: We should probably read, “asked of him the parables.” They asked him concerning the meaning

and interpretation of them. The expression is intermediate between Matt. xiii. 10, where Jesus is asked the reason generally why he teaches in parables, and Luke viii. 9, where he is asked the meaning of the particular parable which he has just uttered.

11. *Unto them that are without*: i.e. outside the narrower community. Comp. 1 Cor. v. 12, 13; Col. iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 7; where it means distinctly those who are not Christians.

12. As the Evangelists (see note on Matt. xiii. 11), in virtue of the saying of Isaiah (vi. 9, 10), which is alluded to here also, assign to Jesus as his original intention what really was the final result of his public preaching, they represent him as speaking in parables in order that the real matter of his preaching may be hidden from the people under this outer covering. The difference is only that here, and in Luke viii. 10, speaking in parables secures the completion of a divine judgment, whereas in Matt. xiii. 11—15 it is the result of a divine sentence which has been passed upon the people. Both alike are later artificial justifications of the simple fact.

13. This verse may also mean, “Ye know not this parable, and how ye are to understand the other parables.” He takes up the question of ver. 10.

21. [Candle, candlestick, should be “lamp,” “lampstand.”]—*Bed*, should be “bench.”—Understanding is only imparted to the disciples in order that it may be further spread abroad. Truth exists that it may be shared, as the object of a light is that its rays may be dispersed as widely as possible. Another form of this saying is found in Matt. v. 15, Luke xi. 33.

22. The saying is universally true, without exception, that everything which actually is, must some time or other be evident to the human intellect. Another form is found in Matt. x. 26 = Luke xii. 2.

24. The more carefully they give heed to what they have heard, the more abundantly will the truth be disclosed to them. The words, “With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you,” which break this connection, are taken from Matt. vii. 2 = Luke vi. 38.

25. *He that hath*: The proper esteem and appreciation of the true riches is represented as itself a possession which increases

by a natural necessity. Stagnation is impossible. The first Evangelist applies the words somewhat differently (see note on Matt. xiii. 12), and the saying appears in a different form again, and with a different meaning, in Matt. xxv. 29 = Luke xix. 26.

**27.** *And should sleep*: i.e. do nothing more (Ps. cxxvii. 2).

**29.** *When the fruit is brought forth*: strictly, “when the fruit allows it.” For the rest, comp. Joel. iii. 13 (in the Heb. iv. 13)

Verses **35—41** = Matt. viii. 18, 23—27 = Luke viii. 22—25.

**35.** The first journey. It is towards the east (Peraea).

**36.** *As he was in the ship*: reference to ver. 1.

**38.** *A pillow*: In the stern of the ship was a pillow, probably intended for the helmsman.

**41.** *What manner of man is this?* “Who is this?”

## CHAPTER V.

Verses **1—20** = Matt. viii. 28—34 = Luke viii. 26—39.

**2.** On the difference between this account and Matthew’s, see pp. 44 sq.

**4, 5.** Only in Mark.

**9.** The dark, mysterious power to which the demoniac feels that he is subject is one, inasmuch as it is ascribed to the devil, but consists, like a Roman legion, of many individuals.

**13.** *Down a steep place*, should be “over the precipice.”—*Two thousand*: only the second Evangelist specifies this. The Roman legion consisted of three times the number, or more.

**20.** *Decapolis*: see note on Matt. iv. 25.

Verses **21—43** = Matt. ix. 18—26 = Luke viii. 40—46.

**22.** *One of the rulers of the synagogue*: each of the synagogues had a governing body consisting of several elders, a local school council.

**30.** Materialistic theory of miracles of the Evangelists founded upon the idea (iii. 10, v. 28, vi. 56) of those who were healed.

**32.** Only in Mark.

**37.** We find this narrower circle of disciples also in ix. 2, xiv. 33, comp. xiii. 3.

**42.** *Twelve years*: this was the duration of the sickness of the woman whose story had become entangled with that of Jairus’ daughter (see ver. 25); and again the story of the son of the

Shunammite woman who, according to 2 Kings iv. 18, “was grown,” probably contributed to the determination of this age (comp. Luke ii. 42).

**43.** *And he charged them straitly that no man should know it :* it was with this view that he had admitted only his most confidential followers (ver. 37), and had driven out the crowd of mourners.

### CHAPTER vi.

Verses 1—6 = Matt. xiii. 54—58 = Luke iv. 16—30.

**1.** *Into his own country,* should be “into his own city.” The second journey of Jesus (comp. iv. 35); this time to the west (Nazareth).

**2.** *What wisdom, &c.:* better, “What kind of wisdom is this which is given unto him, and what are such mighty works that are wrought by his hands ?”

**3.** *The carpenter, the son of Mary :* the mother is mentioned because the father was dead, and Jesus had succeeded to him as “the carpenter” until he exchanged his homely manual labour for the calling of a public teacher.

**4.** *In his own country,* should be “in his own city.”

**5.** *Sick folk,* who were easy to heal. See note on Matt. iv. 24.

Verses 7—13 = Matt. x. 1—14 = Luke ix. 1—6.

**7.** *By two and two :* they are sent out thus in order that they may find strength and encouragement in pursuing their calling in company. Perhaps also after Deut. xix. 5.

**8.** *Save a staff only :* mitigation of Matt. x. 10 = Luke ix. 3.

**9.** *Sandals,* strictly, “light sandals,” [*dimin.* of the ordinary word for sandals]. This is also a mitigation of the other account, though, strictly speaking, it is only taking an extra pair of shoes, in addition to those which the traveller wore upon his feet, that appears to be forbidden in Matt. x. 10; comp. the expression in Luke ix. 3.

**13.** *Oil:* used in ancient times as a panacea. This combination of physical and spiritual remedies appears also in James v. 14.

Verses 14—16 = Matt. xiv. 1, 2 = Luke ix. 7—9.

**14.** The interval until the return (ver. 30) of the disciples who have been sent out is employed in giving an account of the

increasing fame of Jesus which this very mission caused, and in portraying the thoughts about him which occupied the evil conscience in the royal fortress at Tiberias.

**15.** The people, too, now attempt to form some opinion about him. He is regarded as either the actual forerunner of the Messiah who had been foretold, or at least as “a prophet, as one of the prophets” (comp. Luke ix. 8). (The word *or* should be omitted.) In either case, the period without prophets, which was usually supposed to have begun when Malachi ceased to speak (comp. 1 Macc. iv. 46, ix. 27, xiv. 41), is regarded as now closed, and a period of new revelations as having begun.

Verses 17—29 = Matt. xiv. 3—12.

**19.** Only in Mark, but assumed in Matt. xiv. 9. The Old Testament type is the wicked Jezebel who swears to kill Elijah (1 Kings xix. 1, 2), and incites Ahab to murder Naboth (1 Kings xxi. 5—10).

**20.** [*Observed him*: Luther correctly renders the Greek, “kept him safely,” which Holzmann leaves without comment. It may either mean “kept him in safe custody,” or “kept him safe from Herodias’ vengeance.”]—*Did many things*: According to another reading, he was perplexed and penitent whenever he had heard the pious man.

**23.** The Old Testament type is found in Esther v. 2, 3, 6, vii. 2, where the king, “at the banquet of wine,” swears to Esther, after she has “obtained favour in his sight,” that he will give her whatever she demands, “even to the half of the kingdom.” The historical Antipas was no king at all, but a tetrarch (see note on Luke iii. 1), and had not much to divide.

**25.** *By and by*: i.e. “at once,” “immediately”

Verses 30—44 = Matt. xiv. 13—21 = Luke ix. 10—17

**31.** The disciples must have rest, and Jesus desires to be alone with them now that they have returned from their first mission. This same journey to Bethsaida has another reason assigned for it in Matt. xiv. There (ver. 12) the disciples of John, who bury their master’s body (Mark vi. 29), are confused with the disciples of Jesus, who tell him all about the mission they were sent upon (Mark vi. 30), and in ver. 13 it appears as if Jesus had withdrawn

because he was frightened by the news of the Baptist's death.—  
*Apart*, should be “alone.”

**32.** *Privately*, should be “alone.”

**34** = Matt. ix. 36.

**36.** *Into the country round about and into the villages*, means strictly into the farmsteads and small villages. There were no larger places in the immediate neighbourhood.

**37.** *Two hundred pennyworth*: The pence here are denarii, one of which (= 6d.) was at that time a day's wages, whereas in this case twenty-five men would have had to live on it. Thus on the lowest estimate a very considerable sum for that time was required, an amount altogether unattainable by the disciples.

**39.** *By companies*: i.e. in regular separate companies, such as might sit at table together, which were distributed according to the different spots from which the provisions were given out. See note on Matt. xiv. 18.—*Upon the green grass*, i.e. on the lonely grassy marsh-lands east of the point where the Jordan flows into the lake.

**41.** Here the relation of this account to that of the Supper (see note on Matt. xiv. 19) which follows (xiv. 22) is particularly plain, especially as the disciples appear to fill exactly the position of the deacons in Justin Martyr's account of the earliest mode of celebrating the Christian love feasts.

Verses 45—52 = Matt. xiv. 22—33.

**45.** *Bethsaida*: English “Fisherhouse,” the ancient fishing village to the left of the point where the Jordan enters the lake (see note on Matt. xi. 21, xiv. 13) at the foot of a hill on which the tetrarch Philip had built the city of Julias, the ruins of which still look down upon the lake. Jesus comes to the same place after the second feeding (viii. 22). As the disciples are to cross over from here, the true reading would seem to be preserved in old Latin MSS., which have “from Bethsaida” or “to opposite Bethsaida.” Even Josephus knows only one place of this name, though he usually calls it Julias. As to the theory that there was a second Bethsaida on the western shore, supposed to be distinguished from this place because it is called the “Galilean” Bethsaida, while this is Gaulanitish, see John i. 44, xii. 21.

**48, 49.** The unhistorical character of the narrative is betrayed

by the fact that the whole object in view is evidently a mere display of miraculous powers. This is the very opposite to Matt. iv. 6, 7.

**51.** *And the wind ceased* The words are the same as in the first narrative of the stilling of the sea (iv. 39), of which the present is only a second edition.

**52.** Only in Mark. *They considered not the miracle of*: “they had not gained understanding by.”

Verses 53—56 = Matt. xiv. 34—36.

## CHAPTER vii.

Verses 1—23 = Matt. xv. 1—20.

**3, 4.** Only in Mark.

**4.** *Tables*, should be “benches.”

**11.** *A gift by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me*: i.e. “Let that by which thou mightest have derived advantage from me be offered as a sacrifice.”—*Corban*: i.e. “sacrifice,” was the usual expression for anything to be bestowed upon the temple. The son in using it expressly declared to his parents that everything that might be beneficial to them, over and above his own requirements, was intended as a sacrifice for the temple (Prov. xxviii. 24).

**14.** After the breach with the ruling party and their principles, Jesus calls upon the people.

**15.** Waiving the special question of meats, Jesus points out that at the foundation of the law itself lies the thought, that it is only what comes out of a man, issues of various kinds, the discharge of lepers, corrupt matter, that defiles him. At the same time, according to ver. 17, he is uttering a “parable,” inasmuch as he finds here the higher meaning, that nothing that comes to a man from without can defile him, but only that which he as a moral being makes, as it were, out of himself and outwardly presents.

**17.** *Into the house*: He is again in Capernaum, but only temporarily. See p. 40.

**19.** *Purging all meats*: properly, “which makes clean all meats,” i.e. which performs of itself the purification on which the Pharisees bestowed so much pains.

Verses 24—30 = Matt. xv. 21—28.

**26.** *Syrophœniciā*: Syrophœnicia was the Phœnicia which belonged to the Roman province of Syria, as distinguished from Libophœnicia.

**27.** *First*: after Rom. i. 16; mitigation of the speech in Matt. xv. 26.

**31** = Matt. xv. 29. This is the longest journey which Jesus takes, especially if, instead of *from the borders of Tyre and Sidon*, we read, “from the borders of Tyre through Sidon.” If we accept the latter reading, he must first have gone northwards, then from Sidon by the road over Lebanon to Damascus, which according to Pliny was one of the “ten cities” (see note on Matt. iv. 25), and then returned from the east to the Sea of Galilee.

Verses 32—37. Only in Mark.

**32.** *Had an impediment in his speech*: “was dumb.”

**33.** On the spittle, see note on viii. 23. Other similar narratives are also in the mind of the writer, as for example that of Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 19—21) and of Elisha (2 Kings iv. 33—35).

**34.** *Ephphatha*: Aramaic, given as if it were a magic word. See note on ix. 25.

**35.** After Isaiah xxix. 18, xxxv. 5, 6.

## CHAPTER viii.

Verses 1—10 = Matt. xv. 32—39.

**7.** *Blessed*: “gave thanks.” [Better, “offered a blessing.”]

**10.** *Dalmanutha* is otherwise unknown. It is here practically the same as Magdala, which is mentioned in Matt. xv. 39. There is a similar crossing over after the first feeding in vi. 45.

Verses 11, 12 = Matt. xvi. 1—4.

**12.** See note on Matt. xii. 39.

Verses 13—21 = Matt. xvi. 4—12.

**14.** According to this, the conversation took place in the ship, and not, as Matt. has it, xvi. 5, after their arrival at the opposite shore.

**15.** They remain a very short time (comp. ver. 10) on the western shore, the seat of the spiritual guides of the people, the Pharisees, and of the temporal prince who had combined with

them against Jesus (iii. 6); and when they have left it again, Jesus in displeasure speaks against both of these; but the disciples in crass misunderstanding refer his words to the fact that they have not enough bread to suffice for their stay upon the desert eastern shore.

**18.** Only in Mark.

**19, 20.** The disciples must have no anxiety at all about material means of subsistence. In support of this demand upon them, Jesus reminds them of two practical demonstrations of the words in Matt. iv. 4.

Verses **22—26.** Only in Mark.

**23.** Spittle was regarded by the ancients generally as a remedy. According to Tacitus and Suetonius, Vespasian cured a blind man in Alexandria by means of spittle. Our narrative stands on a level with theirs in regard to its historical obscurity. Anyhow, making the blind to see was foretold in the passage in Isaiah (Is. xxxv. 5) which proved so rich in its consequences (see note on Matt. xi. 5). Hence Jesus appears again in Rev iii. 17, 18, as an eye-doctor. In the present narrative of Mark, there is evident reference to the spiritual power of vision which has been mentioned in ver. 18.

**24.** *As trees:* i.e. so indistinctly. Hence it appears that we are not dealing with a man born blind. His restored senses are not yet clear.

**25.** [*Made him look up:* The Greek word here employed is used both of “looking up” and of “looking again,” or “seeing again,” and is even found with the special sense of “recovering one’s sight.” Luther has, “Bid him look again.”]—This is a unique example of a healing which does not take place immediately, but goes through a certain course.

Verses **27—38** = Matt. xvi. 13—27 = Luke ix. 18—26.

**32.** *And he spake that saying openly:* better, “And he spoke this out plainly,” i.e. no longer in mere hints and mysterious forebodings, as in ii. 19.

**33.** *Savourest not:* “thinkest not.”

**34.** We can hardly imagine that what follows was a popular address, such as might have been delivered in one of the villages mentioned in ver. 27. The two other Evangelists only distinguish

it from what precedes as addressed to all the disciples, while the preceding words applied to Peter alone.

**38** = Matt. x. 33.

### CHAPTER ix.

Verse 1 = Matt. xvi. 28 = Luke ix. 27.

The form of expression occupies an intermediate position between the original account of the first and the general character of the expression found in the third Evangelist.

Verses 2—9 = Matt. xvii. 1—9 = Luke ix. 28—36.

**3.** *As snow*: The snow-clad landscape of Hermon in winter (see note on Matt. xvi. 13) forms the background of the picture. Comp. Rev. i. 14.

**6.** *He wist not what to say*: “he knew not what he said.”—The explanation of how Peter could suppose that these marvellous forms needed earthly dwellings.

Verses 10—13 = Matt. xvii. 10—13.

**10.** Only in Mark.

**12.** *And how it is written set at nought*, should be, “And how is it then written of the Son of Man that he must suffer much and be despised ?” If the forerunner has already restored all things to order, how can a lot await the Messiah himself, which depends upon the very opposite supposition ?

**13.** The one thing that is undisturbed is the connection between the lot of the forerunner and that of the Messiah foreseen in the Scriptures. According to the view taken here, Jesus had already recognized both the fall of the forerunner (perhaps 1 Kings xvii.—xix.) and that of the Messiah himself (perhaps Is. liii.) as founded on Scripture. In any case, the lines are here indicated along which the scriptural exegesis of the earliest community moved, with a view to recovering the peace of mind which had been destroyed by this most unexpected issue of events.

Verses 14—29 = Matt. xvii. 14—21 = Luke ix. 37—43.

**14.** The picture which the Evangelist gives of the actual facts before him is affected by the Old Testament type of this story in which the assistants appear waiting below (Exod. xxiv. 14) and occasionally manifesting their own incapacity (Exod. xxxii. 19).

Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, also served as an example of a similar experience (2 Kings iv. 29—32).

**15.** *Were greatly amazed*: as they were at Moses when he was transfigured, Exod. xxxiv. 30.

**17.** *A dumb spirit*: The sickness, which appears from what follows evidently to have been epilepsy, was accompanied by dumbness.

**18.** *Pineth away*: he wastes away.

**19.** Type in Numb. xiv. 27

**21, 23, 24.** Only in Mark.

**23.** This verse should read, “Jesus said unto him, If thou canst! He that believeth can do all things.”—Jesus corrects in the first place the doubt which the father has expressed in the words, “If thou canst.”

**24.** *Help thou mine unbelief*: in case, that is to say, my belief, when tried by thy standard, should still appear as unbelief.

**25.** *Thou dumb and deaf spirit*: Persons so possessed were considered especially difficult to heal, as not accessible by any mode of address. Comp. vii. 34. So also in Ps. lviii. 5, 6, a deaf adder is spoken of which has stopped its ear and listens not to the voice of the charmer.

**26, 27.** Only in Mark. The evil spirit is compelled to depart, but appears to desire first to vent all its rage once more upon the sufferer.

**29.** *And fasting*: a later addition from Matt. xvii. 21.

**30.** *Passed*: strictly “passed by” From the Roman territory (comp. note on Matt. xvi. 23), to which he has withdrawn, Jesus proceeds into Galilee, but only that he may pass through it quickly and as secretly as possible. His goal is Jerusalem and death.

**32.** *Were afraid*: having a presentiment of some evil.

Verses **33—37** = Matt. xviii. 1—5 = Luke ix. 46—48.

**34.** *Should be*: “was.”

**36.** *Taken him in his arms*: a sign of that disposition towards children which is demanded in ver. 37.

**37** = Matt. x. 40.

Verses **38—41** = Luke ix. 49, 50.

**38.** See note on Matt. iv. 24.

**39.** Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 3.

**40.** Obverse of Matt. xii. 30 = Luke xi. 23, where the context is different.

**41** = Matt. x. 41, 42. Here the verse is a continuation of the expression in ver. 39 of the value which is to be attached to the very smallest amount of friendliness.

Verses **42—48** = Matt. xviii. 6—9.

**42.** The “little ones that believe in me,” in the connection in which we find them here, are beginners in the faith, like the worker of miracles in ver. 38. They are to be attracted, not repulsed. On the other hand, in the connection in which they are introduced in Matt. xviii. 6, they have become literally children.

**44, 46, 48.** From Is. lxvi. 24.

Verses **49, 50.**

**49.** Only in Mark.—Every one must be salted with fire. Fire has a painful, but at the same time a purifying effect; salt a caustic, but at the same time invigorating one. Thus we have two symbols for that which gives pain to a man, but at the same time makes him a sacrifice well pleasing to God. Hence the reference to Levit. ii. 13, “Neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat-offering: with all thine offerings shalt thou offer salt.” By the salting which preserves it from corruption, the sacrifice has been made a symbol of man, who either offers himself voluntarily, by some violent self-renunciation such as is prescribed in the commandments of vv. 43, 45, 47, or else is consumed by the fire of hell as an atoning sacrifice for his sins, vv. 44, 46, 48. Commentators waver between the two possible explanations.

**50.** Comp. Matt. v. 13 = Luke xiv. 34. The concluding words, which are peculiar to the second Evangelist, remind us of Col. iv 6, and of the occasion (ver. 34) which gives rise to the whole series of sayings.

## CHAPTER X.

Verses **1—11** = Matt. xix. 1—9.

**1.** *Into the coasts [i.e. borders] of Judea:* The original text here has “and,” so as to read “and beyond Jordan.” They go in the first place to Peraea. Comp. note on xi. 1.

**2.** *Tempting him:* Because Jesus is placed in such a position

that he must contradict either Moses (Deut. xxiv. 1) or himself. There is a different account in Matt. xix. 3.

**3.** **10.** Only in Mark.

**12.** Only in Mark. Application of the same rule to a case which never occurred among the Jews, but was the more common among the Gentiles. Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 10.

Verses **13—16** = Matt. xix. 13—15 = Luke xviii. 15—17

**15.** *As a little child*: with such a disposition and temper, so unpretending and trustful.

Verses **17—27** = Matt. xix. 16—26 = Luke xviii. 18—27.

**17.** *When he was gone forth into the way*: Either the departure into Peræa, which is mentioned in ver. 1, is now actually entered upon, after his opponents have made a last attempt (2—12) and his friends have brought their children to him to take leave (13—16), or else the conversation with the Pharisees takes place as he enters Judea, the blessing of the children at his first resting-place, and the encounter here spoken of as he is leaving it again, after which Jesus is again upon the highway (32) and then (46) in Jericho.

**18.** Jesus rejects the excessive reverence that is paid him by gesture and address, as due to God alone, of whom alone we can say that He *is* good, while among men we can only speak of *becoming* good. So also Luke xviii. 19, but Matt. xix. 17 has it differently.

**19.** *Defraud not*: properly, “withhold not wages;” an addition based upon Exod. xxi. 10, Deut. xxiv. 14.

**21.** *Loved him*: comp. note on Matt. xix. 21.

Verses **28—31** = Matt. xix. 27—30 = Luke xviii. 28—30.

**29.** *Or wife*: is wanting in many of the old manuscripts. It seemed from ver. 30 to be out of place.

**30.** *With persecutions*: as a necessary accompaniment disturbing their happiness in this world.

Verses **32—34** = Matt. xx. 17—19 = Luke xviii. 31—34.

**32.** *They were amazed*: “they were terrified,” when they saw how he was actually taking the road to the capital where he himself had foretold that he should perish.

Verses 35—45 = Matt. xx. 20—28 = Luke xxii. 24—27.

42. Comp. Matt. xx. 25. The rulers among the Gentiles maintain their position only by making the wishes and interests of others subservient to their own wishes and interests. So also in Luke xxii. 25, where the addition is made that they also cause themselves to be addressed as “benefactors,” a customary title of respect in ancient times.

Verses 46—52 = Matt. xx. 29—34 = Luke xviii. 35—43.

46. *Bartimæus*: Aramaic, meaning simply “son of Timæus.”

50. Only in Mark.—*Garment*: strictly, “cloak.”

51. *Lord*: here “Rabbuni,” instead of “Rabbi” as in ix. 5, = “great Master.”

### CHAPTER xi.

Verses 1—11 = Matt. xxi. 1—11 = Luke xix. 28—38.

1. *Bethphage and Bethany*: the latter name serves to define the former more exactly. Travelling from Jericho, they would first come to Bethany, a mile and three quarters (English) from Jerusalem (John xi. 18) on the south-east slope of the Mount of Olives; then, turning the corner, they would reach Bethphage, whence Jerusalem appeared in sight. Comp. note on Matt. xxi. 1.

2. *Into the village*: i.e. the village of Bethany last mentioned.—*A colt*, may be either a horse or an ass.—*Whereon never man sat*: fit therefore for a sacred purpose; see Numb. xix. 2; Deut. xxi. 3; 2 Sam. vi. 3.—In all three respects Luke xix. 30 agrees with Mark, while Matt. xxi. 2 differs from them.

3. *And straightway he will send him hither*: the oldest text has, “and will send him back hither at once.” Jesus promises the owner, who was no doubt known to him, that he will send the colt back to him very shortly. Different in Matt. xxi. 3.

4. *Where two ways met*: i.e. where the way into the farm-yard led out of the highway.

8. *Branches*: strictly “litter;” here small branches and sprays.

10. Only in Mark. With the representative of God comes also the Messianic kingdom.

11. End of the first day in Jerusalem, according to the second Gospel. Different in Matt. xxi. 17.

Verses 12—14 = Matt. xxi. 18, 19.

12. [When they were come from: strictly, “when they had gone out from.”]

**13.** As the fruit appears on the fig-tree before the leaves, this tree being full of leaves seemed to promise figs already. —*The time of figs was not yet*: the proper summer fig (karinouse) does not ripen until August, the early fig (biccurah) not until June. We cannot suppose that late or autumn figs which had hung through the winter are here meant, as the fact that the tree had leaves on would have nothing to do with them. In the neighbourhood of the Sea of Galilee the season for figs lasted (according to Josephus) for ten months, and it was from that part of the country that Jesus derived his expectations.

Verses 15—19 = Matt. xxi. 12—17 = Luke xix. 45—48.

**16.** Only in Mark. The forecourt of the temple was wrongly used as a thoroughfare, as appears from the carrying of household utensils through it, in order to save the trouble of some more circuitous route.

**17.** Only in Mark.—*Of all nations the house of prayer*, should be “a house of prayer for all nations” (Is. lvi. 7).

**19.** End of second day, according to the second Evangelist.

Verses 20—24 = Matt. xxi. 20—22.

**20.** After Ps. xxxvii. 35, 36.

**21.** Only in Mark.

Verses 25, 26 = Matt. vi. 14, 15.

The connection with what precedes is as follows: the wish that Jesus had uttered in perfect confidence in God was a curse; but it does not therefore follow that we, in like faith that our prayers will be heard, may curse those who have done us ill.

Verses 27—33 = Matt. xxi. 23—27 = Luke xx. 1—8.

**28.** *Doest thou these things?* The last thing that Jesus had done was to make the attack upon the proceedings in the temple (vv. 15, 16) at which the priests had been enraged the day before (ver. 18.) He must tell them whence he derives his official authority for this, and show them his commission. Different in Matt. xxi. 23, and different again in Luke xx. 2.

## CHAPTER xii.

Verses 1—12 = Matt. xxi. 33—46 = Luke xx. 9—19.

**2—5.** The three servants represent the long series of prophets,

one after another of whom appears upon the scene, but with more and more disastrous results.

Verses 13—17 = Matt. xxii. 15—22 = Luke xx. 20—26.

Verses 18—27 = Matt. xxii. 23—33 = Luke xx. 27—38.

**26.** *In the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him:* “In the book of Moses, in the bush, how God spake unto him.” “In the bush,” means in the passage about the burning bush, Exod. iii. 2—4, and especially iii. 6. This was the ancient manner in which particular passages of Scripture, which was not yet divided into chapters and verses, were referred to.

Verses 28—34 = Matt. xxii. 34—40 = Luke xx. 39, 40.

**28.** In Matt. xxii. 35, he asks in a very different spirit.

**29.** Only in Mark, from Deut. vi. 4; the great confession of faith of Israel (Shma).

**32—34.** Only in Mark.

Verses 35—37 = Matt. xxii. 41—46 = Luke xx. 41—44.

**36.** *By the Holy Ghost:* i.e. as a prophet. Comp. Acts ii. 30.

**37.** An enigma which has been carelessly passed over by the prevailing school of biblical learning.

Verses 38—40 = Matt. xxiii. 1, 6, 7, 14 = Luke xx. 45—47.

Verses 41—44 = Luke xxi. 1—4.

**41.** *The treasury,* which consisted of thirteen boxes, placed in the forecourt of the women, was intended for small contributions to the temple, as well as for the legal temple-tax. From this source the priesthood derived enormous wealth.

**42.** *Two mites:* rather less than a farthing, see note on Matt. v. 26. Smaller sums might not be put in.

#### CHAPTER xiii.

Verses 1—37 = Matt. xxiv. 1—42 = Luke xxi. 5—36.

**1.** *What manner of stones:* white, shining blocks of marble piled one upon another, as if for a fortress.

**9** = Matt. x. 17, 18.—[*They shall deliver you up to councils, and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten:* “They shall deliver you up to councils and synagogues; ye shall be beaten,” &c.]

**11—13** = Matt. x. 19—22.

**28.** *Is yet tender:* “becomes juicy.” [Strictly, “has become soft to the touch.”]

**33, 34.** Only in Mark.

**35.** See note on Matt. xiv. 25.

**36, 37.** Only in Mark.

**37.** See note on Luke xii. 41.

#### CHAPTER xiv.

Verses 1, 2 = Matt. xxvi. 1—5 = Luke xxii. 1, 2.

Verses 3—9 = Matt. xxvi. 6—13 = Luke vii. 36—50.

**3.** *Bōr*, should be “bottle.”—[*Spikenard*: The Greek is “pure nard” (or as some take it, “liquid nard.”)]—*She brake the bōr*, properly, “the bottle;” i.e. she broke the neck of the bottle that she might pour out unsparingly the whole contents, and at the same time prevent the vessel which was thus consecrated from being used again.

**5.** *Pence*: i.e. “denarii.”—*They murmured against her*: lit. “they set upon her.”

Verses 10, 11 = Matt. xxvi. 14—16 = Luke xxii. 3—6.

**11.** *Conveniently*: strictly “at a convenient time.”

Verses 12—16 = Matt. xxvi. 17—19 = Luke xxii. 7—13.

**13.** Legendary development of details originating in 1 Sam. x. 2, 3, 5, and perhaps Gen. xxiv. 14. It assumes the belief in supernatural knowledge.

**15.** *Furnished*: strictly “furnished with cushions.”

Verses 17—25 = Matt. xxvi. 20—29 = Luke xxii. 14—23.

**22.** *Blessed*: “gave thanks.”

**23.** *They all drank of it*: The cup was passed from hand to hand, whereas Jesus had divided the bread amongst them himself.

**24.** *New Testament*, should be “covenant.”

Verses 26—31 = Matt. xxvi. 30—35 = Luke xxii. 33, 34.

**30.** *Twice*: The night-watch of “cock-crow” (xiii. 35) lasted from the first to the second cock-crow, i.e. through the first three hours after midnight. Some of the old MSS. omit the word “twice,” and all the expressions referring to it in vv. 68, 72, are also of doubtful authority.

Verses 32—42 = Matt. xxvi. 36—46 = Luke xxii. 39—46.

**33.** *To be sore amazed*: “to tremble.” [“To be seized with horror, or anguish,” De Wette.]

**35.** *The hour:* the time of abuse and death which was approaching.

**36.** *Abba:* Aramaic; in English, “Father.” From the lips of Jesus (see note on Matt. vi. 9—13) this name of God had come into daily use among Christians. Hence we find it in Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6, with the addition “Father,” just as if it were a proper name.

**41.** *The hour:* which he had prayed might be averted in ver. 35.

Verses **43—50** Matt. xxvi. 47—56 = Luke xxii. 47—53.

**43.** *One of the twelve:* emphasized because it is the fulfilment of ver. 20. There only the second Evangelist has these words, but here they are given by the two others also.

**49.** *But the Scriptures must be fulfilled:* “But that the Scripture may be fulfilled.”

Verses **51, 52.** Only in Mark.

When the company broke up late in the evening, a young man of the house where Jesus had kept the passover had wakened up out of his sleep, wrapped a linen cloth round him, and followed them. Hence he nearly fell into the hands of the captors (who, moreover, are not described as young men in the older MSS., but simply spoken of as “they”). On his flight, comp. Amos ii. 16.

**51.** *Young men,* should be “they.”

Verses **53—65** = Matt. xxvi. 57—68 = Luke xxii. 54, 55, 63—71.

**54.** *Warmed himself:* explanation in John xviii. 18.

**56.** *Agreed not together:* as it must do according to Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15. Comp. Sus. 51—61.

**58.** *Made with hands      made without hands:* These words, which go beyond what is said in Matt. xxvi. 61, are intended to convey the meaning really contained in the saying on which the accusation brought against Jesus was based; they make it amount almost to what is said in John iv. 21, 23, inasmuch as it promises a new divine community in place of the temple worshippers. See the development of this idea, 1 Cor. iii. 9, 16, 17, vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Apoc. vii. 48, xvii. 24.

**59.** *Neither so:* The more exact definitions of the general statement contradicted each other, and indeed to this day we do not know what Jesus actually said about this.

**60.** *Stood up in the midst*, should be “stepped into the midst of them.”

**61.** *The Blessed*: standing epithet of God according to the later Jewish usage.

**65.** *Prophesy*: i.e. prophesy who struck thee; Matt. xxvi. 68 = Luke xxii. 64.

Verses **66—72** = Matt. xxvi. 69—75 = Luke xxii. 56—62.

**68.** *The porch*: “the courtyard” outside the great gate.

**69.** *A maid*: “the maid.”

**70.** *And thy speech agreeth thereto*: not in the oldest MSS.

#### CHAPTER xv.

Verses **1—19** = Matt. xxvii. 1—30 = Luke xxiii. 1—25.

**1** = Matt. xxvii. 1, 2 = Luke xxiii. 1.—*Held a consultation*: three old MSS. read, “they prepared a deliberation,” which accurately expresses the exact form which still required to be fulfilled in the final sitting.

**2—5** = Matt. xxvii. 11—14 = Luke xxiii. 3.

**3.** [*But he answered nothing*: Luth. omits these words, which are not found in the oldest MSS.]

**6.** [*At that feast*: see note on Matt. xxvii. 15. The Greek phrase is the same in both passages.]

**8.** Only in Mark. The people who now approached, and not Pilate (see note on Matt. xxvii. 17), raised the question of mercy. [Luther renders this verse, “And the people went up, and begged him to do as he was accustomed to do.”]

**9.** A sad and fatal mingling of mockery and pity. The people could not put up with a Messiah and King standing senseless in chains.

**11.** The priests give the cue, “Barabbas,” a name which was well received by the people. See note on Matt. xxvii. 16.

**16.** *The hall called prætorium*: the courtyard of the judgment-hall.

Verses **20, 21** = Matt. xxvii. 31, 32 = Luke xxiii. 26.

**21.** *Alexander and Rufus* (comp. Rom. xvi. 13) were Christians well known to the readers of the second Gospel.

Verses **22—32** = Matt. xxvii. 33—44 = Luke xxiii. 32—38.

**23.** *Myrrh*: resinous sap of a shrub, having an aromatic taste.

**25.** At nine o'clock in the morning.

**28.** This verse, referring to Is. liii. 12, is not genuine here. It has been inserted from Luke xxii. 37.

Verses 33—38 = Matt. xxvii. 45—53 = Luke xxiv. 44—46.

Verses 39—47 = Matt. xxvii. 54—61 = Luke xxiii. 47—56.

**39.** *That he so cried out:* whereas usually those who were crucified wrestled at least for a day with death, while their dying cries became weaker and weaker. This powerful cry and sudden death seem to the Gentile worthy of a son of the gods.

**40.** *James the less:* so called in distinction from celebrities of the same name.

**42.** *The preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath:* That this Friday, being the 15th of Nisan, was at the same time a high festival, and like a Sabbath (Exod. xii. 16, Levit. xxiii. 7) a day on which such proceedings as those in which the Jews have so far been engaged could not properly take place, does not appear to be considered. The sanctity of the day is eclipsed by that of the Sabbath proper, and moreover the execution of a blasphemer might be regarded as an act of worship (John xvi. 2); according to Numb. xxv 4, Deut. xxi. 22, 23, 2 Sam. xxi. 9, he was “hung up unto the Lord, in the face of the sun.”

**43.** *Counsellor:* member of the high council.—*Also:* comp. Luke ii. 25, 38.

**44.** Only in Mark.—*Any while:* i.e. whether he had died sooner than might have been expected. See note on ver. 39.

**47.** *Mary the mother of Joses:* In ver. 40, she is mentioned with the names of both her sons; in xvi. 1, with the name of the other only.

#### CHAPTER XVI.

Verses 1—8 = Matt. xxviii. 1—8 = Luke xxiv. 1—10.

**1.** *Had bought:* “bought.”

**3.** Only in Mark.

Verses 9—20.

The spuriousness of this passage, which is not found in the oldest MSS., is universally acknowledged, and was declared even by some of the Fathers. The whole of it is a meagre abstract taken from the other three Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

**9.** From John xx. 1, 14—17, Luke viii. 2.

10. From John xx. 18, Luke xxiv. 10.
11. From Luke xxiv. 11, 17.
12. From Luke xxiv. 13—31.
13. From Luke xxiv. 33—35, 41.
14. From Matt. xxviii. 17; Luke xxiv. 25, 36—43; John xx. 27
- 15, 16. From Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxiv. 47.
17. From Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xvi. 18, xix. 6, 15; Luke x. 19.
18. From Acts xxviii. 3—9.—*It shall not hurt them*: Papias relates this of Justus Barsabas (Acts i. 23).
- 19, 20. From Matt. xxviii. 20; Luke xxiv. 48, 51; Acts i. 8, 9.  
In place of these last twelve verses, some of the old MSS. have the following shorter conclusion: “But all that was committed to them, they (the women, ver. 8) announced to Peter and those that were with him. But afterwards Jesus himself also sent forth by them the holy and imperishable preaching of eternal blessedness from the east even unto the west.”

## THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE.

### CHAPTER I.

**1—4.** Commonly called the prologue or introduction.

1. *To set forth in order*, &c., should be “to write down an account of those things which have been fulfilled among us.”—*Many*: see p. 39.

2. *The beginning*: Here, the beginning spoken of in the note on Mark i. 1. This verse speaks of the sources and authorities of all evangelical and apostolic tradition. These are partly eyewitnesses of the life of Jesus from the baptism by John, partly “ministers of the word,” the assistants of the apostles, such as Mark, Luke, Philip the Evangelist. Contributions from all these, either written or oral, were employed in the composition of our Gospels.

3. *To me also*: Others had preceded him in our first two Gospels.—*Having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first*, should be “After I had diligently inquired into everything from the very beginning.”—“The very beginning,” goes beyond “the beginning” in ver. 2, inasmuch as Luke collected the traditions of the birth and childhood of Jesus, and even of John the Baptist.—*Theophilus*: see p. 48. From the manner in which he is here addressed (see Acts xxiii. 26), a man of some distinction.

4. See pp. 37 sq.

5. One of the peculiarities of growing legends is, that the later the point of time at which our informants stand, and the more impossible it is for them to have any information beyond that already given, the more they appear to know. Mark begins with John the Baptist; Matthew, with the birth of Jesus; Luke goes back to the birth of John the Baptist, which was six months before that of Jesus (vv. 26, 36). In contradiction to ii. 1, 2, the birth of Jesus is here placed in the days of Herod. As this

occurs also in Matt. ii. 1, it affords the safest statement, comparatively speaking, as to the date of the birth of Jesus.—*Of the course of Abia*: the eighth of the twenty-four classes of priests which performed in turn the temple services.—*Elisabeth*: the name, according to Exod. vi. 23, of Aaron's wife; while Mary is the same name as Miriam, which, according to Exod. xv. 20, was the name of his sister.

**7** Old Testament type in Gen. xviii. 11.

**9.** The classes served week by week, but the individual duties, and so especially the honour of offering incense, changed from day to day.

**10.** Contemporary picture of public worship. While the offering of incense took place morning and evening in the interior of the sanctuary, silent prayer was offered in the forecourts of the temple.

**13.** *Thy prayer*: It is assumed that he was praying either for offspring for himself, or for the Messianic salvation of the people.—*John*: The name means “pleasing to God.” Old Testament type, Gen. xvi. 11, xvii. 19.

**15.** Description of a Nazirite, after Numb. vi. 2 sq., 1 Sam. i. 11. The substance of the verse is expressed in the very words of Judges xiii. 4, 7, 14, where Samson's mother before his birth is commanded by the angel to abstain from wine and strong drink, “for the boy shall be a Nazirite from the womb.” Moreover, Samson's birth was as improbable as that of John, and was announced beforehand by heavenly messengers. See note on Matt. ii. 23.

**17.** Description of the calling of the Baptist in the words of the prophet Malachi, which were first applied to him by Jesus (Matt. xi. 10). In these words the prophet proclaims at the end of history a great manifestation of God, and as a preparation for it the re-appearance of the prophet Elijah. See Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5, 6 (in the Heb., iii. 1, 23, 24).

**18.** Imitation of Gen. xv. 8, xvii. 17, xviii. 12.

**19.** *Gabriel*: in English, “Man of God,” as the angel is called in Judges xiii. 6, 8, who announces beforehand the birth of Samson. But it is not until after the Persian era that we find the seven angel-princes who stand around the throne of God, each with his proper name (Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21).

20. So Daniel is struck dumb by the appearance of an angel (Dan. x. 15 sq.). The Jew of the age in which our introductory narratives originated, lived in the sacred books, and he involuntarily represented all his ideas in their colours. Comp. pp. 37 sq.

21. *That* should be “when.”

25. *Looked on me* should be “hath deigned.”—Elizabeth is ashamed, and at the same time takes comfort, inasmuch as this will suffice to obliterate the disgrace which, according to Jewish ideas, was attached to barrenness.

26. In opposition to the first Gospel (see note on Matt. ii. 5), the third regards Nazareth, the historical birthplace (see note on Matt. ii. 23), as the home of Mary from the first. Its task is, therefore, to bring her for a time to Bethlehem, which is done in ii. 1 sqq. First, however, this version of the introductory narrative brings the two mothers of the two great ones of Israel into personal contact, corresponding to the later relation of their sons, and serving as a type of it (see note on ver. 43).

27. *Espoused*, should be “betrothed.”—*Of the house of David*: refers even here to Joseph. Comp. Luke ii. 4, iii. 23, 31. The introductory narratives are indifferent as to Mary’s genealogy, although, on the supposition that Jesus had no human father, everything would depend upon it.

28. *Highly favoured*: blessed by the favour of God. From this verse is taken the first part of the angelic salutation, as it is called, of Catholic devotion (*Salutatio angelica, Ave Maria*).

31. Here the name is announced beforehand to the mother; in Matt. i. 21, to the father. The most important change which has taken place in regard to this part of the introductory narrative, in the course of its development, is that the event which is about to occur is foretold, not to Joseph, but to Mary, whereby the whole affair is made more inoffensive.

32. A genuine Jewish view of the Messiah and Messianic salvation.

33. Eternity of the Messianic rule, after Micah iv. 7, Daniel vii. 14. Different in Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 24—28.

35. *The Holy Ghost* is often spoken of in the translation of the Gospels, where in the original we find simply “holy spirit” in an impersonal sense, equivalent to the “power of the Highest” in the second clause, which will “overshadow” Mary, as in Exod.

xl. 34, Numb. ix. 15, 1 Kings viii. 10, Is. vi. 4, every appearance of God upon the earth is enveloped in a cloud. This Spirit of God is, moreover, thought of as a power which is the medium of God's influence upon the world, like "the Word" in the fourth Gospel (John i. 3). This verse contains accordingly the precise theory of that fatherless conception of Jesus which we find mentioned also in the introductory chapters of Matthew's Gospel. Here is the climax of what has been said in the Old Testament of the birth of Isaac, Samson and Samuel, and in our introductory history (following such types) of the birth of John. If in the birth of late-born children, such as Isaac, the divine creating power has had the chief share (Rom. iv. 17 sqq.), here it does all. So far, indeed, the Jewish idea of God, which was altogether inconsistent with an actual natural parental relation, had resisted any development of this kind. But the Gentile world was very familiar with "sons of the gods" in a grosser sense than that of Judaism (see note on Matt. ii. 15), and found them, indeed, even in historical characters, as, for instance, Pythagoras, Plato, Alexander, Augustus. This idea was adopted as soon as Christianity had begun to settle in Greek circles, while at the same time the coarser and more material elements involved in it were removed.

**36.** *Cousin* should be "kinswoman." This relationship between Jesus and John is altogether foreign to actual history, and even to the representation of the fourth Gospel (John i. 31, 33).

**39.** *Into the hill country*: So Samuel's parents, according to 1 Sam. i. 1, dwelt on Mount Ephraim.—*A city of Judah*: Some city or other in Judea, but not the city of Juta mentioned in Josephus, xv. 55, xxi. 16.

**41.** The sequel to i. 15. The type is in Gen. xxv. 22, where Rebekah's children, the brothers who are afterwards enemies, struggle together while still in the womb.

**43.** *Mother of my Lord*: In Matt. iii. 14, the Baptist is introduced as aware of his inferior position in relation to the Messiah, and here this knowledge is assigned to the mother, contrary to actual history. See note on Matt. xi. 3.

**46.** Here begins Mary's song of praise (Magnificat), as it is called, which is an imitation throughout of the song of Hannah, mother of Samuel (1 Sam. ii. 1—10).

**47.** After 1 Sam. ii. 1.

**48.** After 1 Sam. i. 11.

**49.** After 1 Sam. ii. 2.

**51.** After 1 Sam. ii. 3, 4.

**52.** After 1 Sam. ii. 8.

**53.** After 1 Sam. ii. 5.

**55.** *Abraham and his seed*: to be referred to God's remembrance in ver. 54, which is for Abraham's good.

**58.** [*Cousins*: "kinsfolk;" same word as in ver. 36.]

**59.** *On the eighth day*: according to Gen. xvii. 12. Naming was connected with circumcision (Gen. xxi. 3, 4), as it now is with baptism.

**62.** They asked him, so to speak, by signs.

**63.** *Saying*: i.e. in writing.

**66.** *What manner of child shall this be?* "What will this child be?"

**68.** The song of Zacharia (called Benedictus) is a cento from various passages in the psalms and prophets; as, for example, this verse from Pss. xli. 13, lxxii. 18, lxxxv. 2, cvi. 48; Is. xlivi. 1; Ecclesiasticus xxxv. 17; Wis. x. 15.

**69.** *Horn*: symbol of power; comp. 1 Sam. ii. 1, 10; Ps. xviii. 3.

**76.** Comp. ver. 17

**78.** Recollection of Hos. vi. 3.

**79.** Recollection of Is. ix. 2.

**80.** Anticipation of iii. 2, 3, and imitation of Judges xiii. 24, 25.

## CHAPTER ii.

**1.** *Augustus*: the first Roman emperor. Under Herod and Archelaus, the land of Judea was indirectly subject to the supremacy of Rome; but from the time when the latter was deposed and it was made a Roman province, it was directly subject to Rome. Augustus, therefore, is represented as having issued a decree that the inhabitants of the empire should be "registered," i.e. enrolled in public lists with a view to taxation. The emperor did three times direct a general registration of Roman citizens (*census populi*) to be made, but this did not extend to all the provinces ("all the world").—[*Taxed* (here and in vv. 3, 5) should be "registered," or "enrolled." So also *taxing*, in ver 2, "registration," or "enrolment."]

**2.** “And this registration was the first, and was made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.” It is certainly correct that a census in Judea was first taken under the emperor Augustus, at the time when Publius Sulpitius Quirinus (Cyrenius is the Greek form) was governor of Syria (A.D. 7—11), when Archelaus was deposed, and Judea and Samaria were annexed. The Romans then took a census of the land, which was the occasion for the revolt of Judas, mentioned in Acts v. 37. But, according to this, Jesus would have been born in the year 7 “after the birth of Christ,” which is inconsistent with the probable date given in Luke i. 5, Matt. ii. 1. It is impossible to reconcile the two dates, for this reason, that Judea could not be subject to a census embracing the whole empire until it had been made a Roman province, least of all while it was still under Herod the Great. It is clear, moreover, from Acts v. 36, that our author’s views altogether of the chronological relations of this census are somewhat confused. He introduces it here simply for the sake of bringing Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem.

**4.** In the description of the measures here taken, Roman census and Jewish family registration are confounded with one another. If “all the world” had been enrolled after this fashion, the result would have been a general migration of nations. Moreover, it was now a thousand years since Joseph’s ancestor lived in Bethlehem. Cumbersome machinery to attain the end pointed out in the note on i. 26.

**5.** But the end in view is still unattained; for when a Roman census was taken, it was not at all necessary for women to appear. Moreover, Mary is here represented as not yet Joseph’s wife, as in Matt. i. 24, but only his betrothed. The received text, which our translators accepted, has, *with his espoused wife*; but in i. 27, she is only betrothed, and here also we should read, with the oldest MSS. and translations, simply, “with his betrothed.” And yet, notwithstanding her precarious state, she makes the unnecessary journey. The whole account is a tissue of impossibilities.

**7. First born:** This Evangelist, like all the others, assumes that she afterwards bore a number of other children. In consequence of her laying the child in a manger, this scene was early placed, though without any necessity, in a stable. The tradition of the second century universally represents it as in a cave.

8. We are carried into the shepherd world. David, Cyrus, and Romulus, were also brought up among shepherds. Here the shepherds afford a contrast to the exalted, the great and learned (comp. i. 51—53). The flocks were taken out in March, and brought under shelter again in November. It is therefore assumed that the birth of Jesus took place in summer, but afterwards, in order to associate the birth of Jesus with the Roman festival in celebration of the lengthening days after the winter solstice, the Church transferred the date to the end of December. The same general idea is certainly found both in the Roman festival and this narrative of the birth of Christ, the night scene here being affected by the passage in Is. ix. 2 : “The people that walketh in darkness seeth a great light.” See note on i. 79.

11. *In the city of David* : i.e. in Bethlehem.

12. *A sign* : a pledge of the divine origin and truth of their words, as in Is. vii. 14.

13. *A multitude of the heavenly host* : all angels, regarded as the guards of God, as in 1 Kings xxii. 19.

14. The “angelic song” (*Gloria in excelsis*) in the oldest MSS. consists not of three parts, but two: “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of (the divine) goodwill.”

19. After Gen. xxxvii. 11.

21. See note on i. 59. Jesus was “born of a woman and subject to the law” (Gal. iv. 4). The legend here celebrates the faithful observance of the law.

22. After the first week, a woman who had borne a child had still thirty-three days to remain in the house; see Levit. xii. 3, 4. According to Luke, the parents of Jesus only remained these forty days in Bethlehem. Our Evangelist regards the whole affair as a presentation of the new-born child before God.

23. See Exod. xiii. 2.

24. See Lev. xii. 8.

25. *The consolation of Israel* : the Messiah and his kingdom.

27 *The parents* : the idea of the supernatural conception of Jesus has not penetrated to this part of the legendary materials here collected together. Comp. vv. 33, 41, 43, 48.

32. After Is. xlvi. 6.

33. *Joseph and his mother* : “his father and mother.”

34. Words are here put into Simeon’s mouth which were not

possible until after later experiences. Comp. Matt. xxi. 44; Rom. ix. 33; 2 Cor. ii. 16. The Old Testament original is in Is. viii. 14, 15.

**35.** *A sword*: i.e. “the scandal of the cross,” 1 Cor. i. 23.

**39.** Here they return, in Matt. ii. 23 they remove for the first time, to Nazareth.

**41.** Old Testament types are the parents of Samuel, who, according to 1 Sam. i. 3, 21, ii. 19, went up to the tabernacle at Shiloh. The feast of Easter was the first in the annual series of Jewish festivals, and was in remembrance of the exodus from Egypt, i.e. of the birth of Israel as a nation.

**42.** In his twelfth or thirteenth year the boy became subject to the law, “a son of the law”

**44.** *In the company*: “among the travellers.” [The Greek word means strictly “the company of travellers,” “caravan.”] The festival caravan was again in motion on the journey home.

**46.** The scene is laid in a school in the court of the temple. It was customary for the pupils to propound questions as well as the teachers.

**49.** When he had left his earthly parents, he could only be in the house of God [the Greek phrase here is literally “in those of my Father,” which may mean either “in my Father’s house,” or “about my Father’s business;” Luther renders it, “in that which is my Father’s,” preserving the ambiguity of the original]. The pregnant saying which is the first of those handed down to us as coming from the lips of Jesus, contains a happy anticipation of the peculiar thoughtfulness of his life. It is in harmony with the general tendency of legend to represent great men “while they are still boys” as engaged in some employment, or placed in some situation bearing upon their lofty destiny. So Augustus, as son of Apollo, while an infant, was missed from the place where he had been laid, and at last was found again at the top of a lofty tower on the eastern side, the side of good omen (*Suetonius*).

**52.** The Old Testament source of this passage, in which the genuine human development of Jesus is shown, is 1 Sam. ii. 26. Samuel, who is there depicted in the same manner, similarly (1 Sam. iii. 1—14) perceived the call of God in his early years.—*Stature*: This is probably the correct translation, rather than “age,” as some render it. That he increased in age is a matter of course.

## CHAPTER iii.

Verses 1—6 = Mark i. 1—6.

1. The date is defined in six ways, a result of the learned care of the third Evangelist. The fifteenth year of Tiberius, the successor of Augustus, extends from August 19th, A.D. 28, to the same day, A.D. 29. His representative in Palestine from 26—36 was the procurator Pontius Pilate. But Pilate's power only extended over that part of the land, as cut up by Herod's will, which had belonged to Archelaus (see note on Matt. ii. 22). There still remained at that time as independent tetrarchs—the name given to such petty princes from the quartering of districts which originally belonged together—the brothers Herod Antipas (deposed 39 A.D.) and Philip (died 34 A.D.). The only difficulty is about Lysanias, who is spoken of as tetrarch of Abilene. This was the name given to a district near Lebanon, from its chief city, Abila. It is generally denoted by Josephus as the “former,” or “so-called,” kingdom or tetrarchy of Lysanias, who, according to his account, was a king of Iturea who died as early as 36 B.C. Unless some more successful attempt can be made than has been hitherto, to distinguish a later Lysanias from this earlier one, we must explain this statement as an error of the Evangelist.

2. It is a standing error of our author (comp. Acts iv. 6) to introduce, as high-priest, Annas, who lost that office in the year 14 A.D., and whose fourth successor, reigning from 18—36 A.D., was his son-in-law Joseph, called Caiaphas. We find the correct statement in Matt. xxvi. 57, John xviii. 13. It is true that Annas was still living at this time, and saw sons and sons-in-law made high-priests.—*The word of God came*: imitation of Jer. i. 2, 4.

5, 6. Completion of the passage in Isaiah (of which only the first verse, Is. xl. 3, is common to the three Gospels) from the Greek translation (Is. xl. 4, 5).

Verses 7—9 = Matt. iii. 7—10.

7. *Generation*: “brood.”

9. [Strictly, “And already the axe lies at the root of the trees.”]

Verses 10—15. Only in Luke.

The Baptist's address to the various classes of society. Comp. Acts xiii. 25.

Verses 16, 17 = Matt. iii. 11, 12.

Verses 18—20. Only in Luke.

The further course of John's life is here pointed out, and the contents of Mark vi. 17—19 are anticipated.

**19.** *His brother Philip's wife*: “his brother's wife.”

Verses 21, 22 = Mark i. 9—11.

**21.** *And praying*: an addition frequently found in this Gospel (v. 16, vi. 12, ix. 18, 28, 29).

**22.** If Jesus had been from the first, as represented in this Gospel, the begotten son of the Spirit, there would have been no meaning in a later endowment with it. The Evangelist therefore turns the spiritual occurrence (Mark i. 10 = Matt. iii. 16) into a visible one, and makes the Spirit come down upon him *in a bodily shape like a dove*, and treats the whole scene as an external testimony to Jesus before the assembled people (comp. ver. 21).

Verses 23—38.

A second attempt (see note on Matt. i. 1) to restore the genealogical table of the house of David. This one also (see note on Matt. i. 16) starts from the assumption that Jesus was descended from David through his father Joseph, for which reason our Evangelist concludes his introductory narrative with the remark that Jesus was “supposed to be the son of Joseph.” At the same time, if this is only a supposition, the whole genealogy of the latter becomes superfluous. Just as the genealogy of Matthew gives the double seven three times (see note on Matt. i. 17), so this one gives the single seven eleven times. Genealogical tables arranged according to typical numbers in this way are the less to be credited with historical value. They are simply the products of Jewish-Christian activity in this field. At the same time, the importance of the one in the hands of the Pauline Evangelist on the side of universal religion, is no less striking than the service which is afforded by the other in support of the Jewish-Christian view of the first Evangelist (see p. 50).

**27.** Zorobabel occurs also in the list in Matthew (i. 12, 13). But between him and Joseph, the husband of Mary, are nine persons in Matthew, eighteen in Luke.

**31.** The two registers are distinguished from one another by the fact that in the first the descent is traced from David through Solomon, thus preserving the royal line; while in the second

it is through the Nathan who is mentioned in 2 Sam. v. 14, 1 Chron. iii. 5.

33. *Which was the son of Aram*, should be “which was the son of Admin, which was the son of Arni.”

#### CHAPTER iv.

Verses 1—13 = Matt. iv. 1—11.

The third temptation in Matthew appears as the second in Luke, and vice versa.

2. According to Mark i. 13, the temptations lasted forty days. According to Matthew, they came at the end of the forty days. Luke combines the two accounts.—*He did eat nothing*: The fasting in Matt. iv. 2 here rises to the miraculous.

5. *In a moment of time*: A miracle with regard to time is added to the miracle with regard to space.

6. See note on Matt. iv. 8.

9. *The Son of God*: “God’s Son.” [So also *Alford, Tisch., Lach., Tregelles*, with the oldest MSS.]

13. *All the temptation*: “every temptation.”—*For a season*: He begins afresh, xxii. 3, 28, 40. Hence the angels which appear in Matt. iv. 11 = Mark i. 13, are removed by our Evangelist to the later passage (see xxii. 43).

Verses 14, 15 = Mark i. 14, 21, 22.

Verses 16—30.

In the account common to the other two Gospels, the scene in Nazareth does not come till later (Mark vi. 1—6 = Matt. xiii. 53—58). The third Evangelist not only describes it in a later and more detailed form, but also removes it to the very beginning of the public career of Jesus. This he does, not only in order to establish more clearly the return to Nazareth (Matt. iv. 13), but also because the words of Jesus (24—27), and his lot among his own people (28—30), afford the most fitting introduction to a Gospel which celebrates the transition of Christianity from the Jews to the Gentiles. The arbitrary transposition is betrayed by the reference in ver. 23 to deeds which have been done in Capernaum, whereas he does not go there until ver. 31.

16. Whoever wished to speak in the synagogue worship, made known his intention by standing up.

**17.** *Opened* should be “unrolled.” From this passage and Acts xiii. 15, it seems that as early as this time readings from the prophets had become customary in the synagogue, in addition to the traditional reading of the law (Acts xv. 21), just as it has been customary in Christian worship to read the Gospels and the Epistles. These readings were afterwards called haphtarrah, to distinguish them from the parashah.

**18, 19.** Is. lxi. 1, 2, combined with Is. lviii. 6.

**23.** The proverb is met with among Jews, Greeks and Romans.—*Thy country* should be “thy native city ;” but the native city here represents the native country, inasmuch as the behaviour of the people of Nazareth is intended to be a type of what Jesus had to expect from his fellow-countrymen generally

**25.** See 1 Kings xvii. 8—16. Instead of the three years of 1 Kings xviii. 1, we find three and a half, the significant half seven, in James v. 17, as well as here (comp. Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7; Apoc. xi. 2, 3, xii. 14, xiii. 5).

**26.** *Sarepta* : The widow therefore was a Gentile.

**27.** The leper healed was a Gentile. Comp. 2 Kings v. 1—14.

**29.** On the position of Nazareth, see note on Matt. ii. 23.

Verses 31—37 = Mark i. 21—28.

The third Evangelist here returns to the order of the second.

Verses 38—41 = Mark i. 29—34.

**41.** The speech of the demons is taken from Mark iii. 11.

Verses 42—44 = Mark i. 35—39.

As Peter has not yet been called, Mark i. 36 is omitted.

## CHAPTER V.

Verses 1—11.

These verses here take the place of Mark i. 16—20. The transposition is betrayed by the fact that the experiences of miracles, which, according to iv. 38, 39, Peter had already passed through, are altogether ignored in ver. 8. Here, as in iv. 16—30, in the place of the simple and unimpeachable account, we find a later development, which appears altogether miraculous, legendary, and indeed consciously allegorical.

**1.** Instead of solitude, a popular gathering on the sea-shore ; the effect of Mark i. 39.

2. Instead of men fishing, fishermen who are washing their nets on the shore ; partly from Mark i. 19.

3. From Mark iv. 1. Being anticipated here, this description of their putting out from the land is omitted from Luke viii. 4, which properly corresponds to Mark iv. 1.

4. *The deep*, into which they are to push out, signifies the Gentile world. The narrative of the calling of the apostles is turned into an allegorical picture of their mission to the whole world.

5. Unwillingness of Peter and the first apostles to undertake the Gentile mission, in spite of the smallness of their success among the Jews.

6. It was not until they went among the heathen that Christianity made real progress.—*Their net brake*: The rent which the question of the Gentile mission threatened to make in the Church. When the danger had passed away the result was the later correction, John xxi. 11, “yet was not the net broken.”

8. Peter is here afraid of the presence of Jesus, as the godly man in the Old Testament in the presence of God. Comp. Exod. xxxiii. 20; Judges xiii. 22; Is. vi. 5.

9, 10. *He was astonished*: “Terror came upon him.” The terror which the apostles, who are still in the trammels of Judaism, at first feel in regard to the divine action in the conversion of the Gentiles. [The meaning of the Greek is probably astonishment rather than terror.]

10. The great and simple utterance (Mark i. 17), which is the historical foundation of this whole passage, has here been developed into a material but at the same time very suggestive picture.

11 = Mark i. 20.

Verses 12—16 = Mark i. 40—45.

12. *City*: alludes to Mark i. 38.

16. Later mention of the prayer which is omitted in iv. 42. But comp. note on iii. 21.

Verses 17—26 = Mark ii. 1—12.

17. *Was present to heal them*, should be “was active so that he healed.”

23. *Thy sins be forgiven thee*: “thy sins are forgiven thee.” [The Greek is the same as in ver. 20.]

Verses 27—39 = Mark ii. 13—22.

**27.** *Publican receipt of custom*: “tax-gatherer tax-office.”

**29.** The third Evangelist takes Mark ii. 15 = Matt. ix. 10, to mean that the meal was in the house of the newly-called tax-gatherer; and he thus explains the presence of the other tax-gatherers in the company.

**39.** Only in Luke. Palates that are accustomed to “the good old wine” would rather not learn the sharp, rough taste of the must: a hint in regard to the treatment of the question of progress for the many persons who are disposed to cling to whatever is old, and cherish it so affectionately.

#### CHAPTER vi.

Verses 1—5 = Mark ii. 23—28.

**1.** *Second Sabbath after the first*: a phrase which cannot be explained, and for which the oldest authorities give simply “Sabbath.”

Verses 6—11 = Mark iii. 1—6.

**9.** *On the Sabbath days*, should be “on the Sabbath.”

Verses 12—19 = Mark iii. 7—19.

**12.** Here Jesus prepares himself in prayer by night for the important business of the next day (see note on iii. 21).—*A mountain* should be “the mountain.”

**15.** *Simon called Zelotes*, i.e. “zealot.” A name given, from the time of the rising of Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 37), to the extreme and most enthusiastic of the Pharisees: the party that urged a rising against Rome. In Mark iii. 18 = Matt. x. 4, we find in place of it the Aramaic word “Canani” in the Greek form; this might certainly mean simply a citizen of Cana in Galilee (John ii. 1, 11, iv. 46, xxi. 2); hence “Simon of Cana.”

**16.** *Judas the brother of James*: see note on Matt. x. 3.

**17.** According to this, Jesus delivers the same address standing on a plain, which, according to Matt. v. 1, he delivers sitting upon a mountain.

**19.** See note on Mark v. 30.

Verses 20—49.

This is the outline that the first Evangelist has filled up with

his “Sermon on the Mount” (Matt. v. 3—vii. 27). Here it is simply an address to the apostles, strictly confined to the moral fundamental regulations of the kingdom which is to be founded by them, and to be defended and enlarged by means of all the resources of patient love. See note on vv. 39, 40.

Verses 20—23 = Matt. v. 3, 4, 6, 11, 12.

Four blessings.

Verses 24—26. Only in Luke.

Four woes corresponding to the four blessings, reproduced from Matt. xxiii. 13 sqq. in an entirely new form. Type in Deut. xxvii. 15 sqq.

Verses 27—42.

Forbearance, and love of enemies.

27, 28 = Matt. v. 44.

29 = Matt. v. 39, 40.

30 = Matt. v. 42.

31 = Matt. vii. 12.

32 = Matt. v. 46.

33, 34. Only in Luke. In Matthew, this is replaced by Matt. v. 47.

35 = Matt. v. 44, 45.

36 = Matt. v. 48.

37, 38 = Matt. vii. 1, 2.

39, 40. These verses break the connection, and have been interpolated from Matt. xv. 14, x. 24.

41, 42 = Matt. vii. 3, 5.

Verses 43—49.

Concluding similes.

43—45 = Matt. vii. 16—18, 20, xii. 33—35.

46 = Matt. vii. 21—23.

47—49 = Matt. vii. 24—27.

## CHAPTER vii.

Verses 1—10 = Matt. viii. 5—13.

2. *Servant*: see note on Matt. viii. 6.

3—5. A tradition peculiar to the third Evangelist, in contradiction of Matt. viii. 6.

**6, 7.** Different in Matt. viii. 8. The humility of one born a Gentile here goes still further than in Matt.

Verses 11—17. Only in Luke.

The raising of one who is actually dead is introduced, in addition to the healing of one who is “sick and ready to die” (ver. 2), in order to prepare for the words, “the dead are raised” (ver. 22); while the remaining contents of ver. 22 are established immediately before in ver. 21. By Nain, where this event is placed, we must understand the Galilean place of that name lying south of Nazareth, in the immediate vicinity of Shunem. The origin of the narrative is found in the raising of the son of the Shunamnite by Elisha (2 Kings iv. 18—37), combined with the similar miracle which Elijah performed upon the son of the widow of Sarepta, who has been mentioned in iv. 26 (1 Kings xvii. 17—24).

**15.** *And he delivered him to his mother*: after 1 Kings xvii. 23.

**16.** *Visited*: The Greek word is the same as in i. 68, 78.

Verses 18—35 = Matt. xi. 2—19.

**20, 21.** Only in Luke.

**29, 30.** Interpolation from Matt. xxi. 31, 32.

**30.** *Rejected the counsel of God against themselves*, should be “brought to nought God’s counsel to themselves.”

**35.** *All*: inserted by the third Evangelist contrary to the original reference of the saying to an individual. See note on Matt. xi. 19.

Verses 36—50.

The story which appears in Mark xiv. 3—9 = Matt. xxvi. 6—13, is here introduced earlier as a justification of ver. 34. The narrative is at the same time brought to bear upon the way in which Jesus received lost and outcast sinners, which Luke so often brings into prominence. Hence the anointing by a female disciple in the house of one who is unclean (Simon the leper, Mark xiv. 3), here becomes an anointing by one who is unclean in the house of the “clean” (Simon the Pharisee, see vv. 36, 40). This affair reminds us also of the companionship of Jesus with sinners at table (Mark ii. 15), and of the entrance of publicans and harlots into the kingdom of heaven in place of the Pharisees (Matt. xxi. 31).

**37.** *A sinner*: The Gentiles are simply “sinners” (Gal. ii. 15).

In this altered form of the narrative the woman represents them.—*Alabaster*: as in Mark xiv. 3.—*Box*, should be “bottle” or “vase.”

**38.** *At his feet behind him*: quite a natural position, from the custom of reclining at meal-time explained in the note on Matt. ix. 10.

**39.** Companion piece to the murmuring of the disciples in Matt. xxvi. 8, 9.

**40.** Parallel to the words of Jesus in defence of the woman in Matt. xxvi. 10.

**41, 42.** The parable of the fifty and five hundred francs reminds us of Matt. xviii. 23 sqq.

**44—46.** In the place of the negligent Simon, who had forgotten the usual courtesies, she has, as it were, saved the honour of the house by her behaviour to Jesus. See note on Matt. vi. 17.

**47.** Either the love which is manifested is the proof of the forgiveness of sins which has taken place, or else the two things mutually act and re-act on each other.

**49.** After Matt. ix. 3.

**50.** After Matt. ix. 22.

#### CHAPTER viii.

Verses 1—3. Only in Luke.

This stands here on account of its connection with the preceding section (see ver. 2).

**2.** *Magdalene*: see note on Matt. xxvii. 56.—*Seven devils*: according to xi. 26, this indicates a relapse.

**3.** The women here mentioned are not otherwise known.

Verses 4—18 = Mark iv. 1—25.

**16.** [Candle candlestick: “lamp lampstand.”]

Verses 19—21 = Mark iii. 31—35.

These verses are placed here on account of the connection between ver. 21 and ver. 15.

Verses 22—25 = Mark iv. 35—41.

**25.** *What manner of man is this? “Who is this?”*

Verses 26—39 = Mark v. 1—20.

**31.** *Into the deep*: The meaning is, “into hell” (see note on Matt. viii. 30), from which it is supposed the devils are continu-

ally trying to get out, in order to live comfortably in the bodies of men, or at least of beasts.

**33.** *Down a steep place* should be “over the precipice.”

Verses 40—56 = Mark v. 21—43.

**42.** *One only*: an addition of the third Evangelist, as in vii. 12, after 2 Kings iv. 14 sqq., where the son of the Shunammite appears as an only child.

**51.** *To go in*: Confusion of the entrance into the house (Mark v. 38, 39) with the entrance into the chamber of death (Mark v. 40).

#### CHAPTER ix.

Verses 1—6 = Mark vi. 7—13.

Verses 7—9 = Mark vi. 14—16.

**9.** The third Evangelist is unwilling to give a cultivated man credit for vulgar superstition (Mark vi. 16 = Matt. xiv. 2), and so alters the speech of Herod, and by the concluding words of the verse prepares us for the statement in xxiii. 8.

Verses 10—17 = Mark vi. 30—44.

**10.** See note on Mark vi. 45.

Verses 18—26 = Mark viii. 27—38.

**18.** After a considerable digression, the third Evangelist again takes up the thread of the narrative, but in such a way that the scene is still laid in the same place as in the preceding passage (Mark vi. 46), and he rejects the journey to Cæsarea Philippi.

**23.** *Daily*: an addition of the Paulinist, after Rom. viii. 36, 1 Cor. xv. 31, 2 Cor. iv. 16.—[*Will come*: i.e. “desires to come.”]

**24.** [*Will save*: i.e. “desires to save.”—*Will lose*: strictly, “shall lose.”]

Verse 27 = Mark ix. 1.

Verses 28—36 = Mark ix. 2—9.

**28.** *An eight days*: a week. See note on Matt. xvii. 1.

**31, 32.** Only in Luke. In recollection of the scene in Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 40), this enigmatical event is placed in the night, and a reference to the death of Jesus is added to it.

**33.** Peter desires to delay the departing forms.

**34.** In imitation of Exod. xxxiii. 10, the dwellers on earth behold in astonishment how the heavenly forms enter the clouds.

Verses 37—45 = Mark ix. 14—32.

**37.** *The next day*: an addition inconsistent with the original narrative. Probably the type of this is Moses remaining all night on the Mount of the Revelation, Exod. xxiv. 18.

**38.** *Mine only child*: an addition like that in viii. 42.

**43.** According to this representation, Jesus desires to subdue the exultation of the disciples at this success by pointing out to them the dark future.

Verses 46—48 = Mark ix. 33—37.

Verses 49—50 = Mark ix. 38—41.

Verses 51—56. Only in Luke.

**52.** *Samaritans*: see note on Matt. x. 5. According to Matt. xix. 1 = Mark x. 1, Jesus' journey takes place on the further side of the Jordan; according to the account of the third Evangelist (see also xiii. 22, xvii. 11), he proceeds along the western bank to Jerusalem, and so passes through Samaria, which separates Galilee from Judea.

**54.** *Even as Elias did*: 2 Kings i. 10, 12.

**55.** These words of Jesus (with a reference to 1 Kings xix. 11, 12) are wanting in some very old MSS., as are also the reference of the disciples to Elijah which precedes, and the explanation afterwards, which is introduced from xix. 10.

Verses 57—60 = Matt. viii. 19—22.

Verses 61, 62. Only in Luke.

An advance upon 1 Kings xix. 19—21.

**62.** One who is at the plough has only to attend to the furrow that he desires to plough.

## CHAPTER X.

Verses 1—16 = ix. 1—6.

**1.** *Other seventy*: In distinction from the twelve who were sent out in ix. 1, 2, there appears here another and wider circle of disciples. The third Evangelist really gives the same mission address here over again, but from a different and fuller source, while he justifies the repetition by representing this second address as directed to different hearers, whose number is determined by the type of the “seventy elders” (Numb. ix. 16, 25), and is just as significant as the number twelve (comp. Exod. xv. 27, the twelve

springs and seventy palm-trees in Elim). At the same time, the third Evangelist regards these seventy disciples as intended for the new field of labour which Jesus has entered upon among the Samaritans, the first fruits of the seventy Gentile nations which the Jews were accustomed to reckon (after Gen. x.). Still the actual conversion of the Gentiles is committed to the twelve (xxiv. 47).

**2** = Matt. ix. 37, 38.

**3** = Matt. x. 16.

**4** = Matt. x. 10.—*Salute no man*: The Eastern forms of salutation are very ceremonious and would cause delay.

**5** = Matt. x. 12.

**6** = Matt. x. 13.—*The son*: “a son.”

**7** = Matt. x. 10. Comp. the more extended form in 1 Cor. ix. 4—14.

**8.** See 1 Cor. x. 27.

**9** = Matt. x. 7, 8.

**12—15** = Matt. x. 15, xi. 21—24.

**16** = Matt. x. 40.

Verses **17—20**. Only in Luke.

**18.** Comp. Is. xiv. 12; Rev. xii. 9. The power of the evil one is destroyed from its foundations.

**19.** After Ps. xci. 13; Ezek. ii. 6.

**20.** *Names are written in heaven*: The idea of the book of heaven is found in Exod. xxxii. 32, 33; Ps. lxix. 29; Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5.

Verses **21, 22** = Matt. xi. 25—27.

Verses **23, 24** = Matt. xiii. 16, 17.

Verses **25—37**. Only in Luke.

This is a more detailed form of the same narrative that was given shortly in Matt. xxii. 35—40 = Mark xii. 28—34.

**29.** *To justify himself*: i.e. to show that the matter is not so simple, the question not so superfluous, as it seems.

**30.** Between Jerusalem and Jericho is a desert tract which in the time of Jerome was still rendered unsafe by robbers.

**32.** *Levite*: member of the tribe entrusted with the care of matters connected with public worship, the first line of which consisted of the priests proper.

**34.** *Oil and wine*: often mentioned by the ancients as medicinal.

**35.** *Pence*: denarii (see note on Mark vi. 37).

**36.** In the opinion of the Scribe, the chief thing was the question, who, according to the correct scholastic view, could be considered a neighbour. The answer of Jesus makes the chief thing the question, how one practically becomes neighbour to any one.

Verses 38—42. Only in Luke.

This passage is further developed in John xi. 1 sqq., xii. 1 sqq.

**42.** *One thing is needful*: i.e. to hear my words. But some old MSS. read, “only a little, or one thing, is enough,” which we should have to understand as referring to the dishes at table.

## CHAPTER xi.

Verse 1. Only in Luke.

Verses 2—4 = Matt. vi. 9—13.

In the oldest MSS. the prayer here is still shorter: “Father, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; our needful bread give us daily; and forgive us our sins, for even we forgive all who are indebted to us; and lead us not into temptation.”

Verses 5—8. Only in Luke.

This is quite consistent with the tendency of Luke mentioned in the note on iii. 21.

Verses 9—13 = Matt. vii. 7—11.

Verses 14—26.

**14, 15** = Matt. ix. 32—34, xii. 22—24.

**16** = Matt. xii. 38.

**17—23** = Matt. xii. 25—30.

**24—26** = Matt. xii. 43—45.

Verses 27, 28. Only in Luke.

Practically the same as viii. 19—21, with which passage the present one is connected by the reference to the mother, the vicinity of viii. 16 = xi. 33, and the identity of expression in viii. 21 = xi. 28.

Verses 29—32 = Matt. xii. 39—42.

**31, 32.** *A greater*: “more.”

Verses 33—36 = Matt. v. 15, vi. 22, 23.

**33.** *In a secret place*, should be “into concealment.”—[*Candilē candlestick*: “lamp lampstand.”]

**36.** Cumbersome obverse of Matt. vi. 23.

Verses 37—54.

Only in Luke, in so far as it is not represented by Matt. xxiii. 4, 13, 23—36.

**37.** *To dine*: strictly speaking breakfast is meant. So also xiv. 12; Matt. xxii. 4. The chief meal of the day took place in the evening.

**38.** See note on Matt. xv. 2.

**39** = Matt. xxiii. 25.

**40, 41** = Matt. xxiii. 26.

**41.** A loving deed makes the hands clean.—*Such things as ye have* should be “that which is therein.”

**42** = Matt. xxiii. 23.

**43** = Mark xii. 38, 39.

**44** = Matt. xxiii. 27, 28.—*Are not aware of them*: and hence defile themselves without knowing it (Numb. xix. 16). Above such a burial-ground arose in the life-time of Jesus the half-Gentile royal city of Tiberias, the residence of Herod Antipas, always avoided by Jesus.

**46** = Matt. xxiii. 4.

**47** = Matt. xxiii. 29.

**48.** A different arrangement of Matt. xxiii. 31. The work by which the sons thought to atone for the deeds of their fathers may be conversely regarded, from the point of view of simple continuity, as bringing in the climax and completion.

**49—51** = Matt. xxiii. 34—36.

**49.** *The wisdom of God*: The quotation from a Jewish writing no longer extant (comp., however, 2 Chron. xxiv. 19) extends to the words, “between the altar and the temple,” in ver. 51.

**52** = Matt. xxiii. 13.

**53.** *To provoke him to speak*, should be “to question him.”

## CHAPTER xii.

Verses 1—12.

A compilation from Mark viii. 15, Matt. x. 19, 20, 26—33, xii. 32, introduced by an occasion which is rather obscure, and is little suited to the greater part of these sayings (ver. 1).

Verses 13—21. Only in Luke.

**13.** *The inheritance*: comp. xv. 12.

Verses 22—34 = Matt. vi. 25—33.

**26.** Only in Luke.

**32.** Only in Luke.

Verses 35—38. Only in Luke.

**35.** *Let your loins be girded about*: The long Oriental garment was girt up, that it might not be in the way of free movement in walking or working (Jer. i. 17).—*Lights burning*: as in Matt. xxv. 4.

**36.** *From the wedding*: from a wedding feast to which he had been invited as a guest.

**37.** *He shall gird himself*: the converse of the preceding state of things. Carried out in John xiii. 4—17.—*Come forth* should be “come to them.”

**38.** *Watch*: see note on Matt. xiv. 25.

Verses 39—46 = Matt. xxiv. 43—51.

**41.** *To all*: answer in Mark xiii. 37.

**42.** The bearing of the new question which follows, instead of an answer, upon the question of Peter, depends partly upon the prominent position among his fellow-servants assigned to him in Matt. xvi. 19 as well as here, and partly upon the special responsibility which, according to vv. 47, 48, distinguished the intimate disciples from the rest of the believers.

Verses 47—50. Only in Luke.

**48.** The proportion of the demand to the opportunity here spoken of is vividly illustrated in Matt. xxv. 14—30.

**49.** *Fire*: according to the description that follows, a violent spiritual ferment.

**50.** *But I have, &c.*: i.e. “But I must first be baptized with a baptism.”—*Baptism*: see note on Matt. xx. 22.

Verses 51—53 = Matt. x. 34—36.

Verses 54—56 = Matt. xvi. 2, 3.

Verses 57—59 = Matt. v. 25, 26.

**57.** Only in Luke; introduced in order to connect what precedes with what follows.—*Of yourselves*: without the judge mentioned in ver. 58.

**58, 59** = Matt. v. 25, 26. But if we take it in connection with ver. 27, the adversary would not be a man, but the same who is also judge, viz. God, early reconciliation with whom is recommended.

**58.** *Officer* should be “exactor.”

**59.** *Mite*: lepton. See note on Matt. v. 26.

### CHAPTER xiii.

Verses 1—17. Only in Luke.

**1.** We know nothing more of this slaughter, which Pilate must have committed among Galilean pilgrims in the temple court on the occasion of some festival. Josephus, however, relates very similar acts of this same governor, and this time Barabbas may very likely have been involved in the matter (comp. Mark xv. 7).

**4.** *The tower in Siloam*: in the south-east of the city (see note on John ix. 7). Of this disaster also we know nothing more.

**6.** *Fig-tree*: symbol of Israel (Jer. xxiv. 2 sq.), like the vine which twines round it, and is therefore also mentioned with it in Hos. ix. 10. See notes on Matt. xxi. 19, 33. In Matt. xxi. 19, the symbolic speech becomes a symbolic act.

**8.** Jewish care of trees (Deut. xx. 19).

**11.** *Could in no wise lift up herself* should be “could not stand quite upright.”

**14.** He attacks the people, but he means Jesus.

Verses 18—21 = Matt. xiii. 31—33.

Verses 22, 23. Only in Luke.

\* Verse 24 = Matt. vii. 13.

Verses 25—27 = Matt. vii. 21—23, xxv. 11, 12.

Verses 28, 29 = Matt. viii. 11, 12.

Verse 30 = Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16.

Verses 31—33. Only in Luke.

**31.** *Herod will kill thee*: i.e. “Herod desires to kill thee.” Herod wishes to be free from the embarrassment of the Messianic disturbance in his territory, but does not venture upon an open attack. Here also (as in Mark iii. 6, viii. 15) the Pharisees, in their attempt to intimidate the Messiah, act in concert with Herod.

**32.** *That for*: The answer passes over the go-betweens to the

crafty tetrarch himself.—*Three days*: proverbial for the shortest space of time. During the meagre period that is still vouchsafed him, he will allow nothing to interfere with his activity.—*Be perfect*: “make an end.”

**33.** The other side of the matter: this same short period which still remains he will not employ simply in the exercise of his calling (ver. 32), but also for a journey to Jerusalem; not, however, in order to please Herod, but because Jerusalem, not Herod, has the sad privilege of slaying the prophets.

Verses **34, 35** = Matt. xxiii. 37—39.

**35.** *Left unto you desolate*, should be “forsaken.”

#### CHAPTER xiv.

Verses **1—15**. Only in Luke, except vv. 3, 5, 11.

**3** = Mark iii. 4.

**4.** Legendary development of this story in vi. 6—11.

**5** = Matt. xii. 11, 12.

**7.** *A parable*: The address in vv. 8—10 cannot be intended for anything else (comp. ver. 11). But the third Evangelist takes it as a direction for behaviour at table, and represents it, according to what follows in vv. 12—14, as being uttered at the table of his host. The words of the latter verses (12—14) would in that case be positively rude. This is an example of an unfortunate attempt to supply a traditional saying of Jesus with an historical frame.

**8—10.** After Prov. xxv. 6, 7.

**11** = Matt. xxiii. 12.

**14.** *The resurrection of the just*: a Pauline idea (1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. vi. 16), see p. 50.

**15.** Connecting link occasioned by the promise in ver. 14 and the subject of the parable in ver. 16.

Verses **16—24** = Matt. xxii. 1—14.

This was given in Matt. in a simpler form.

**21—23.** Picture of the calling of the Gentiles.

Verses **25—27** = Matt. x. 37, 38.

**25.** Only in Luke.

**26, 27** = Matt. x. 37, 38, but with stronger expressions.

Verses 28—33. Only in Luke.

Though found only in Luke, this passage stands in the closest connection with ver. 27, as pointing out all that is involved in the resolution spoken of in that verse.

Verses 34, 35 = Matt. v. 13.

35. *For the dunghill* : as manure.

#### CHAPTER xv.

Verses 1—3. Only in Luke. [Comp. Matt. ix. 10 sqq.]

Inserted as an introduction to what follows.

Verses 4—7 = Matt. xviii. 12—14.

A different form of the parable of the Lost Sheep in Matthew.

4. *In the wilderness* : uncultivated land, pasture, in distinction from arable land.

5. After Is. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 16.

Verses 8—32. Only in Luke.

8. *Pieces of silver* : drachmæ. See note on Matt. xvii. 24.

11—32 = Matt. xxi. 28—31, but a more detailed form.

16. *Husks* would mean empty shells. The Greek word means here the pods of a tree still found in Palestine, which are used as food by the very poor (the so-called St. John's bread). [The carob bean, or locust.]

#### CHAPTER xvi.

Verses 1—12. Only in Luke.

2. In these words the steward is already discharged, and has only to give in his account. The opportunity afforded by the performance of this final duty he craftily uses to secure himself against homelessness in the future.

3. *I cannot dig* : i.e. “I cannot work in the fields.”

6, 7. Knowledge of human nature shows that one is to be had cheaper than another, and the experienced steward buys none too dear.

8. *Commended* : when he afterwards became aware of these proceedings, he was surprised by the ingenuity of his former servant, and recognized it as his best quality. That he also condemned his conduct stands to reason, and is moreover assumed in vv. 10—12.—*In their generation* : properly, towards their generation, i.e. in their intercourse with those who are like them.

**9.** [Luther translates this verse: “And I also say unto you, Make to yourselves friends with the unrighteous mammon,” &c.; and Holtzmann’s note depends upon this rendering.] In the application of the parable, again, the qualified praise is to be distinguished from the unqualified blame. In regard to the first, Jesus “also” perceives a sign of true prudence in employing the “unrighteous mammon,” with the possession and use of which in any case so much sin is connected, at least in such a way as is pointed out in Prov. xix. 17 (“He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord”) or Matt. xxv. 40. If we compare the present parable with these sayings, we find that which the Lord himself does as the representative of the poor, is here spoken of as being done by the poor, viz. receiving *into everlasting habitations* (the heavenly antitype of the tents of the patriarchs in the holy land).

**10—12.** The obverse: over against the qualified praise stands unqualified blame of faithlessness and deceit.

**11.** God has entrusted mammon to His children to try them, in order that He may entrust true riches to them in proportion to the use they make of this.

**12.** *That which is another man’s:* because the steward disposed of another’s property as if it were his own.

Verse 13 = Matt. vi. 24.

Verses 14, 15. Only in Luke.

Verses 16—18.

The law and the prophets are spoken of, because the parable which follows culminates in an explanation of their value and perpetual validity (29, 31); similarly ver. 15 prepares for the change of relations in vv. 22, 23.

**16** = Matt. xi. 12, 13.

**17** = Matt. v. 18.

**18** = Matt. v. 32. An example of ver. 17

Verses 19—31. Only in Luke.

**20.** *Lazarus:* later form of Eleazar (“God-help”). A unique example of a proper name in a parable.

**21.** Reminds us of Matt. xv. 27. The third Evangelist seems to take Lazarus as the representative of Gentile Christianity.—

*Licked his sores*: according to some, from compassion; according to others, to increase his sufferings.

**22.** *Abraham's bosom*: In connection with this picture, comp. John i. 18, xiii. 23. Abraham appears, in true Jewish fashion, as president at the heavenly meal. Comp. Matt. viii. 11.

**23.** According to ver. 26, the dwelling-places of the pious (Paradise) and of the ungodly (Hell, Gehenna) are represented as separate places in one and the same region beyond the grave.

**24.** *Flame*: see Mark ix. 44, 46, 48.

#### CHAPTER xvii.

Verses 1, 2 = Matt. xviii. 7, 6.

Verses 3, 4 = Matt. xviii. 15, 21, 22.

Verses 5, 6 = Matt. xvii. 20.

**5.** Only in Luke.

**6** — Matt. xvii. 20.

Verses 7—21. Only in Luke.

**7.** *Will say unto him by and by, when he is come in from the field, Go and sit down* : “Will say unto him when he comes home from the field, Go straightway and sit down”

**7, 8.** Christian reverse of this traditional behaviour is found in xii. 37.

**10.** *Unprofitable servants*: having done nothing which is properly thankworthy, nothing that goes beyond our duty.

**11.** *Through the midst of*: The Greek signifies either “through the midst of” or “between;” but in either case the writer’s ideas are confused, as Jesus had already (ix. 51—53) traversed the Samaritan territory in order to proceed straight to Jerusalem.

**12—19.** Here we have a second form of v. 12—14, with fuller details, after the pattern of the healing of Naaman (2 Kings v. 1 sqq.), which took place in the same neighbourhood. The ten who are healed stand for the ten tribes whose semi-Gentile descendants are represented here, as in x. 30—37, as morally and religiously superior to those of pure Israelitish blood.

**14** = v. 14.

**20.** *With observation*: i.e. so that it can be observed.

**21.** *Neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there!* It is not connected with definite places. See also ver. 23.—*Within you*: As

he is speaking to Pharisees, the other translation, which is also grammatically possible, is to be preferred, viz. “among you,” i.e. it is already here.

### Verses 22—37.

This section is found in Luke alone, except in so far as it coincides with Matt. xxiv. 17, 18, 23, 26—28, 37—41.

**22.** *One of the days of the Son of Man:* when the Messiah shall be visibly present. See v. 35.

**23, 24** = Matt. xxiv. 23, 26, 27.

**26, 27** = Matt. xxiv. 37—39.

**30** = Matt. xxiv. 39.

**31** = Mark xiii. 15, 16.

**32.** *Lot's wife:* She perished with the property upon which she looked back: the relinquishment of all earthly possessions has been previously demanded (ver. 31).

**33** = Matt. x. 39.—*Shall preserve it:* strictly, “shall keep it alive.”

**34.** *Two in one bed:* hence, slaves. Another form of Matt. xxiv. 40.

**35** = Matt. xxiv. 41.

**36.** This verse is wanting in the old MSS. It has been introduced from Matt. xxiv. 40.

**37** Jesus has already answered this question in ver. 24. Here he consequently only points out in his answer (= Matt. xxiv. 28), that where any object of judgment is, there the judgment will be executed.

### CHAPTER xviii.

#### Verses 1—14. Only in Luke.

**3.** *Came:* The word in Greek means that she was in the habit of coming.—*Avenge me:* properly, “do me justice.” So also vv. 5, 8.

**5.** *Lest by her continual coming she weary me,* should be “Lest she come at last and assault me.”

**7.** Comp. Rev. vi. 10.—*And shall not God avenge His own elect though He bear long with them,* should be “And should God not deliver His own elect but bear it patiently.” The phrase “bear it patiently” has some reference to Rev. vi. 11. This passage, the reading in which is somewhat uncertain, is intended to

explain the “stumbling-block” of God’s delay, and belongs historically to later times (2 Pet. iii. 9). So also does what follows.

**11.** *Stood*: comp. Matt. vi. 5.

**12.** *Twice*: according to custom, on Monday and Thursday.—  
*Tithes of all*: see note on Matt. xxiii. 23.

**14.** *Justified*: in the Pauline sense. The rest = Matt. xxiii. 12.

Verses 15—17 = Mark x. 13—16.

Verses 18—27 = Mark x. 17—27.

**18.** *A certain ruler*: because, according to ver. 23, a man of property. Different in Matt. xix. 20.

Verses 28—30 = Mark x. 28—30.

Mark x. 31 has been anticipated in Luke xiii. 30.

Verses 31—34 = Mark x. 32, 34.

**34.** Only in Luke. See note on Matt. xx. 21.

Verses 35—43 = Mark x. 46—52.

**35.** *Nigh unto Jericho*: rather, as he was going out of that city (Matt. xx. 29 = Mark x. 46). The third Evangelist has a special interest in the entrance because of xix. 1—10, and explains by this passage the “press” (xix. 3).

## CHAPTER xix.

Verses 1—10. Only in Luke.

**4.** *Sycamore tree*: properly, “mulberry-fig tree.” Avenues of these trees are found in Oriental towns.

**5.** Jesus recognizes in this tax-gatherer, with his longing to see him, the host who is appointed to receive him during his stay in Jericho.

**8.** *Four-fold*: according to Numb. v. 6, 7, too much; but comp. Exod. xxii. 1.

**9.** *A son of Abraham*: as in xiii. 16, “a daughter of Abraham,” not simply in the sense of national, but also moral kinship.

Verses 11—27 = Matt. xxv. 14—30.

We have fuller detail here than in the corresponding passage in Matthew.

**12.** *A certain nobleman*: The circumstances are taken from the history of the royal house of the Herods. Thus Archelaus and Antipas travelled to Rome to the emperor in order to confirm

or extend their rule, while their subjects at home were dissatisfied (ver. 14).—*Into a far country*: to Italy, where crowns were to be obtained in those days.

**13.** *Pounds*: i.e. minæ. An Attic mina was 100 drachmæ, about £3. 10s.; hence “in a very little” (ver. 17). Vast sums, on the other hand, are distributed in Matt. xxv. 15.

**14.** The Jews protested by an embassy against the rule of Archelaus; here the symbol of their hostility to the Messiahship of Jesus.

**20.** *In a napkin*: i.e. wrapped up and carefully preserved.

**27.** The reckoning with unbelieving Judaism; as in vv. 15—26 we have the reckoning with the believing Christian community.

Verses 28—38 = Mark xi. 1—11.

**28** = Mark x. 32.

**38.** Confusion of the popular cry with the angelic song in ii. 14.

Verses 39—44. Only in Luke.

**40.** *If these hold their peace, the stones will cry out*: a proverbial expression, comp. Hab. ii. 11.

**42.** *If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day*, should be “If only thou also didst know, and in this thy day.”—*In this thy day*: In contrast to the days of Capernaum, of Nazareth, of Bethsaida, which had already passed, Jerusalem’s day of grace had now dawned, when she might submit to the Messiah.

**43.** *Cast a trench* should be “cast up a mound.” In the year 70, Titus cast up a mound of earth and stakes. The origin of the passage is in Is. xxix. 3.

**44.** *Shall lay thee even*, &c., should be “shall dash thee and thy children to pieces on the ground.” Comp. Ps. cxxxvii. 9; 1 Kings ix. 7.—*Shall not leave in thee one stone upon another* = Mark xiii. 2.—*Thy visitation*: when graciously regarded by God. See note on vii. 16.

Verses 45—48 = Mark xi. 15—18.

**47.** *Daily*: The third Evangelist abolishes the reckoning of the days which is found in the first two.

## CHAPTER XX.

Verses 1—8 = Mark xi. 27—33.

**2.** *These things*: viz. the teaching mentioned in ver. 1.

Verses 9—19 = Mark xii. 1—12.

Verses 20—26 = Mark xii. 13—17.

20. *Watched him* should be “lay in wait for him.”

26. *Could not take hold of his words*: i.e. “could not catch him in his speech.”

Verses 27—38 = Mark xii. 18—27.

34. Only in Luke.

38. *For all live unto him*: comp. Acts xvii. 28.

Verses 39, 40 = Mark xii. 28, 34.

The middle part (Mark xii. 29—33) is omitted on account of x. 25—28.

Verses 41—44 = Mark xii. 35—37.

Verses 45—47 = Mark xii. 38—40.

#### CHAPTER xxi.

Verses 1—4 = Mark xii. 41—44.

4. *Living* should be “property.”

Verses 5—36 = Mark xiii. 1—37.

5. *Gifts*: The votive offerings, one of which, for example, was a golden vine dedicated by Herod I. According to this, the speech which follows must have been delivered in the temple. See ver. 37 Different in Matt. xxiv. 1 = Mark xiii. 1.

12. *Before all these*: different in Matt. xxiv. 9. The third Evangelist removes vv. 10, 11, to the distant future.

13. Only in Luke. All this will only result in giving you an opportunity of testifying to the gospel before all the world. The Evangelist is thinking of the history of Paul.

15. Only in Luke. Refers to Acts vi. 10.

18, 19. Only in Luke.—*In your patience possess ye your souls*, should be “by your endurance ye shall save your souls.”—The proverbial form of the promise of these two verses is to be explained by xii. 7, Acts xxvii. 34. The actual meaning, viz. that patient endurance shall preserve them from the last extremity (a free reproduction of Mark xiii. 13), is inconsistent with ver. 16, and refers to the time of the Evangelist himself, who was familiar with proceedings which did not end in death.

20. Historical interpretation of the “abomination of desola-

tion,” Matt. xxiv. 15 = Mark xiii. 14; the Roman army standing on sacred soil.

**21.** *In the midst of it*: i.e. in Jerusalem.

**22.** Only in Luke. This refers to the historical experiences of the year 70.

**23.** *Wrath upon this people*: comp. 1 Thess. ii. 16.

**24.** Only in Luke, partly from the same experiences that find expression in ver. 22, partly from Apoc. xi. 2. The proverbial style of speech after 1 Macc. iii. 45, iv. 60.—*The times of the Gentiles*: after Rom. xi. 25.

**25.** The second half of this verse is literally: “and on earth anxiety of the nations in perplexity at the tumult of the sea and the waves.”

**28.** Only in Luke.

**34—36.** Only in Luke. After Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 18; 1 Thess. v. 2—7; and also especially Is. xxiv. 17

**36.** *May be accounted worthy*: probably we should read, “may be in a position.”

Verses **37, 38.** Only in Luke.

Instead of counting the days and distinguishing between them, the third Evangelist gives a general picture of Jesus’ mode of life in this last period. We find it further detailed in John viii. 1, 2, and indeed John vii. 53—viii. 11 belongs here altogether.

## CHAPTER xxii.

Verses **1, 2** = Mark xiv. 1, 2.

Verses **3—6** = Mark xiv. 10, 11.

**4.** *Captains*: the Levitical temple guard who were to take him prisoner.

**6.** *Promised*, should be “agreed to it.”—*In the absence of the multitude*, should be “without tumult.”

Verses **7—13** = Mark xiv. 12—16.

**12.** *Furnished*: properly, “provided with couches” (on which to recline at table).

Verses **14—23** = Mark xiv. 17—25.

**15—17** Only in Luke.

**16.** *Until it be fulfilled*: As, according to Matt. v. 17, 18, the whole law must be fulfilled, so too the requirements of that part

of it which concerns the Paschal feast will only be fully discharged in the impending kingdom of God. So we sometimes describe the completion of all as “the great supper.”

**18.** According to this, Jesus appears to decline to partake of the wine himself.—*Until the kingdom of God shall come*: on this rests 1 Cor. xi. 26, “till he come.”

**19, 20.** After the narrative of the last supper has been given in vv. 15—18, in a form which agrees pretty closely with the account in the other two Gospels (Matt. xxvi. 29 = Mark xiv. 25), the institution properly speaking follows in the form of the Pauline account, 1 Cor. xi. 23—25.

**20.** *The new testament*, should be “the new covenant”—*In my blood*: properly, “through my blood.” The cup is made a symbol of the new covenant, by the wine which it contains being made a symbol of the blood which is so soon to be shed by a Messiah who sacrifices himself for his people.

**21.** In the ordinary account the announcement of the treachery precedes the supper, whereas here the traitor expressly appears as taking part in it.

Verses **24—27.** Instead of Mark x. 35—45.

**25.** See note on Mark x. 42.

**26.** *The younger*: In Jewish and Christian communities the younger members undertook the more burdensome services (comp. Acts v. 6, 10).

**27, 28.** Only in Luke. For the explanation of the first saying, see John xiii. 4—17 (comp. also note on xii. 37).

Verses **29, 30.** Instead of Matt. xix. 28.

Verses **31, 32.** Only in Luke.

**31.** *Haih desired to have you*: literally, “hath obtained you by asking,” as he did in Job i. 8 sqq., ii. 4 sqq.—*Sift you as wheat*: i.e. with a sieve or a winnowing-fan.

**32.** *I have prayed for thee*: “I have asked for thee.” Development of this in John xvii. 11, 15, 20.—*When thou art converted* [“When thou hast turned back” (in repentance), *De Wette*], *strengthen thy brethren*: development in John xxi. 15—17.

Verses **33, 34.** Instead of Mark xiv. 29—31.

Verses **35—38.** Only in Luke.

Reminiscence of earlier times (ix. 3, x. 4).

**36.** Contrast of the time which has now come upon them, when the disciples, in an unfriendly, hostile world, are directed to self-help, and even to self-defence and strife.—*And he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one:* The ambiguity of the Greek (lit. “He that hath not, let him sell his garment and buy a sword”) is thus correctly removed. The saying itself must be understood figuratively, as in Mark x. 34.

**37.** *The things concerning me have an end,* should be “My affairs are approaching the end.”—That which has befallen the Master, according to Is. liii. 12, will also befall the disciples.

**38.** Misunderstanding on the part of the disciples who had taken with them two swords out of the house when they went out into the night.—*It is enough:* enough want of understanding, enough of disappointment, of speaking and teaching, and of life.

Verses 39—46 = Mark xiv. 32—42.

**43, 44.** Only in Luke. In some very old MSS. these verses are not found. The contents belong to later legend.

Verses 47—53 = Mark xiv. 43—50.

**48.** The older account in Matt. xxvi. 50 is different.

**49.** Only in Luke.

**51.** Only in Luke. This account of the healing is a later legend, but probably refers only to the healing of the wound, not the restoration of the ear that was cut off.

**52.** *Chief priests and captains of the temple and the elders:* These are erroneously supposed to be present: different in Matt. xxvi. 55.

**53.** *Power of darkness:* The third Evangelist has, from ver. 3 onwards, referred the whole treachery to diabolical influence. We have also at the same time the contrast between evil creeping in darkness and the powers of good delighting in publicity and the free light of heaven.

Verses 54—62 = Mark xiv. 53, 54, 66—72.

**58.** *Another:* [the Greek is masculine, showing that a man is here referred to;] according to Matt. xxvi. 71 = Mark xiv. 69, a maid.

**59.** *About the space of one hour after:* rather, according to Matt. xxvi. 73 = Mark xiv. 70, directly after.

**61.** *The Lord turned:* but, according to Matt. xxvi. 69 = Mark

xiv. 66, Peter was standing “without” and “beneath,” whilst Jesus was being examined in an inner chamber further up.

Verses 63, 64 = Mark xiv. 65.

In Matt. and Mark it is the masters, in Luke the servants, who are guilty of this sin.

Verse 65. Only in Luke.

Verses 66—71 = Mark xiv. 55—64.

**66.** *As soon as it was day:* By the immediate introduction of Peter’s denial first (55—62), the third Evangelist puts the examination, which took place while it was still night, later than in Mark xiv. 55, that is to say, he carries it on into the morning.

**67, 68.** Only in Luke. Whereas the terms “Messiah” and “Son of God” are originally synonymous (Matt. xxvi. 63 = Mark xiv. 61), Luke separates them on the ground of his representation of the Christ, and only introduces the condemnation for blasphemy (70, 71) on the confession of divine Sonship (in the sense of i. 35). Jesus tries, however, to escape the answer to the first question by taking it in the sense of the Pauline Gospel, according to which Christ is not so much the Messiah of the Jews as Son of God and Saviour of the world.

**68.** *If I also ask:* i.e. if I as master ask you as pupils. Comp. xx. 3, 44.

**69.** Points to the future, which will give a practical answer to the question proposed, and at the same time will establish its meaning aright.

**70.** *Ye say that I am:* “Ye say it, for I am.”

### CHAPTER xxiii.

Verses 1—5 = Mark xv. 1, 2.

**1** = Mark xv. 1.

**2.** Only in Luke. Detail of the political accusation. The lie is manifest from xx. 25. Ancient Latin translators and Marcion further read here, “and destroying the law and the prophets,” “and perverting women and children.” [Comp. ver. 14.]

**3** = Mark xv. 2.

**4, 5.** Only in Luke.

**5.** *Were the more fierce:* lit. “grew strong,” i.e. “became more violent.”—*From Galilee:* Threatening recollections of Acts v. 37

are called up in the mind of the governor by the mention of Galilee.

Verses 6—16. Only in Luke.

Though only found in the third Gospel, this section is made up from older materials.

7. *Unto Herod's jurisdiction*: see note on Matt. ii. 22.

8. See note on ix. 9.

9. After Mark xv. 4, 5.

10. After Mark xv. 3.

11. *A gorgeous robe*: “a white robe” [the literal meaning of the Greek is “shining”]; a royal robe (comp. Acts xii. 21) put on him in mockery. Changed form of the description in Mark xv. 17, which is not found in the third Gospel.

12. The enmity consisted in the attitude of the Jewish ruler towards the Roman. The friendship followed from the attention which was shown to Pilate by delivering Jesus up to him.

15. *Is done unto him*: “has been brought against him.” [“Has been done by him,” *Alford, De Wette, Meyer, &c.*]

16. Development of this in John xix. 1, 4. The scourging is intended to satisfy the wrath of the priests in place of the crucifixion.

Verses 17—23 = Mark xv. 6—14.

19. See note on xiii. 1.

Verses 24—26 = Mark xv. 15, 21.

Verses 27—31. Only in Luke.

27. *Bewailed*: after Zech. xii. 10—14.

30. After Hosea x. 8. Comp. Rev. vi. 16.

31. After Ezek. xx. 47 (xxi. 3 in the Heb.).

Verses 32—38 = Mark xv. 22—32.

33. [*Calvary*: The Greek word is “Kranion” (a skull), the same that is employed in the interpretation of “Golgotha” in Matt. xxvii. 33, Mark xv. 22, John xix. 17. In Luke it stands alone, as if it were the proper name of the place, and in the Vulgate we find consequently Calvaria (a skull), which our translators retained in the Anglicised form of “Calvary.”]

34. The third Evangelist, avoiding the oldest of the sayings of Jesus upon the cross (see Matt. xxvii. 46 = Mark xv. 34), introduces from later tradition three new ones. The first, after Is.

liii. 12, is an application of the maxim in vi. 28. It is alluded to in Acts iii. 17, and we find it again in the mouth of the dying Stephen, Acts vii. 60, and, according to Eusebius, in the mouth of James before his execution.

**35.** The third Evangelist, having omitted the evidence given against Jesus, the substance of which he gives in another form in Acts vi. 11—14, also omits here the allusion to it which is found in Matt. xvii. 40—Mark xv. 29.

**38.** The statement that the inscription was in three languages has probably been inserted here from John xix. 20.

Verses 39—43. Only in Luke.

This is inconsistent with the older account, Matt. xxvii. 44 = Mark xv. 32.

**42.** *Into thy kingdom* should be “in thy kingdom.” The thief, who represents repentant heathenism, holds already the later belief in a return of the Messiah “in his kingdom” (the same expression as in Matt. xvi. 28), which should far more than counterbalance the dishonour of a malefactor’s death.

**43.** *In paradise*: This Persian word (“pleasure garden”) is used in the Greek version of the Old Testament for the garden of Eden (Gen. ii. 8). Later it was used for the dwelling-place of the pious in the under-world, as distinguished from hell (xvi. 22, 26).

Verses 44—46 = Mark xv. 33—38.

**45.** [*The sun was darkened*. Three ancient MSS. read, “For the sun was eclipsed.”] An eclipse of the sun at the time of full moon, when the passover was held, is impossible.

**46.** The last utterance after Ps. xxxi. 6.

Verses 47—49 = Mark xv. 39—41.

**48.** Only in Luke.

**49.** *All his acquaintance*: detailed statement in John xix. 25.

Verses 50—56 = Mark xv. 42—47.

**54.** *The Sabbath drew on*: What we reckon as six o’clock in the evening of the previous day, would be the beginning of the Sabbath according to the Jewish method of counting the days.

**56.** Only in Luke. Both an offence against the strict Jewish observance of the Sabbath and a contradiction of Mark xvi. 1,

according to which the women did not begin to prepare for embalming the corpse until after the Sabbath had passed.

#### CHAPTER xxiv.

Verses 1—10 = Mark xvi. 1—8.

**3—5.** Only in Luke.

**6.** New form of Matt. xxviii. 6, 7 = Mark xvi. 6, 7 Instead of the disciples being directed to go into Galilee, they are reminded of what Jesus had said to them in Galilee, i.e. of words which, if they had really been spoken, would have rendered the present ones superfluous.

**7, 8.** Only in Luke.

**9.** *Told all these things:* the contrary in Mark xvi. 8.

Verses 11, 12. Only in Luke.

The second of these verses is wanting in many ancient Latin and Syriac MSS.

Verses 13—53. Only in Luke.

**13.** *Furlongs:* lit. “stadia.” A village of Emmaus is pointed out in a charming neighbourhood about seven miles west of Jerusalem. After the destruction of Jerusalem, Roman soldiers were settled there, and from that time the place is spoken of as a colony. Another Emmaus lies half way between Jerusalem and Joppa. It was there that Judas Maccabeus defeated Gorgias (1 Macc. iii. 40, 57, iv. 3).

**18.** Cleopas = Cleopater.

**21.** *And besides all this, &c.:* lit. “But indeed to-day he is spending the third day since these things happened.”

**30.** A remembrance of xxii. 19. *Blessed it:* “gave thanks” [or more strictly, “offered a blessing”].

**34 = 1 Cor. xv. 5.**

**36.** A unique appearance to all the disciples, and moreover in Jerusalem, which, according to Acts i. 8, is to be the centre from which the Church is to develop. Matthew, on the other hand, though he has also a single appearance to all the disciples, places it in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 16 sq.). The words of Jesus are wanting in some of the western MSS. Perhaps they are taken from John xx. 19.

**39.** *Hands and feet:* because they had been nailed to the cross,

and still showed the marks of this. The third Evangelist assumes a tangible and bodily resurrection. See p. 50, and note on ver. 50, below.

40. This verse, like the words of Jesus in ver. 36, is wanting in some of the western MSS. Perhaps it is taken from John xx. 20.

41. *Any meat*: i.e. anything to eat.

42. *And of an honeycomb*: wanting in the oldest MSS.

44. *And in the Psalms*: mentioned because, in the Jewish division of the Old Testament, the third division began with the book of Psalms.

49. *With power from on high*: i.e. with the Holy Spirit, at Pentecost, Acts i. 4, 8, ii. 1 sq. The command to remain steadfast at Jerusalem is in direct contradiction to Matt. xxviii. 7 = Mark xvi. 7, according to which the disciples go at once into Galilee, and do not see the risen One till after they arrive there.

50. *Out as far as to Bethany*. According to this account, Christ shows himself after his resurrection before all the people in the streets, and on the high road.

51. *And carried up into heaven*: wanting in some old Latin MSS.

52. *Worshipped him and*: similarly doubtful.

## THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

---

THE peculiar character of the Fourth Gospel as contrasted with the first three has been acknowledged by the Church itself in all ages. In the ancient Church it was known in distinction from the first three as “the spiritual Gospel.” Luther calls it “the one, tender, chief Gospel.” Herder speaks of it as “the echo of the older Gospels in the upper choir.” The Church was right. The purely spiritual nature of the Christian religion, and at the same time its universality, are brought forward in it with unique power (iv. 21—24, x. 16, xvii. 21). But its peculiarity consists in something more than a different, a loftier and a more honourable conception of the Redeemer and the history of the redemption. The very substance of the Gospel narrative is here in many respects essentially different. Not only do we find in the Gospel according to John different speeches in the mouth of Jesus, which seldom accord with the words reported in the first three Gospels, but the Johannine Christ himself moves in an entirely new circle of ideas. Some of the events narrated are altogether different, others contain the material of the first three Gospels completely transformed. The whole historical frame of the life of Jesus is changed. Moreover, the change is intentional.

### 1. THE OBJECT OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Even without the express assurance of the writer, it would be plain enough that the Gospel according to John is a work cast in one mould, and fashioning all the historical material so

that it may best serve the purpose of one ruling idea. But just as Luke expressly states his purpose in his prologue (i. 1—4), so does the fourth Evangelist state his with the utmost clearness in the epilogue (xx. 31): “But these signs have been written in order that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that through faith ye may have life in his name.” According to xx. 30, tradition afforded the writer much other material, further “signs,” i.e. acts which showed his divine nature and mission; but he wishes to write a Gospel of *selected* narratives, a Gospel of the decisive crises in that great episode in the history of the world, the life of Jesus, a Gospel which both in general and in the minutest details shall serve the purpose of awakening a belief in Jesus as the Christ, as the “Son of God.” Jesus is to him a divine personality, descending from heaven to dwell here below for a season as a man, and then returning to his former state. Moreover, this divine personality is to him the bearer of complete salvation. The purpose of the writer is to represent in a living historical picture a doctrine concerning Jesus, the outlines of which are found in the theological conceptions of the age, which were drawn in part from Greek philosophy. For this very reason he is able to leave on one side a great deal of historical material. He only selects what appears to him most distinctive of the Son of God descending from above. His historical materials are to him nothing but materials, and he uses them with absolute freedom. While he retains the actual history of the fortunes of Jesus as a whole, he does not scruple to change altogether the position and connection both of his acts and his words, to place at the beginning that which only took place later, and at the end that which occurred at the beginning, and even to develope complete new narratives from the scattered hints of his predecessors, e.g. the resurrection of Lazarus from Luke xvi. 31. If we compare John i. 35—51 with Mark i. 16—20, John vi. with Matt. xiv. 13—27, or John xiii. 1—20 with the account of the last supper in the first three Gospels, we shall see that the writer deals with the historical material handed down to him, as a poet, except that

he is guided not only by artistic, but still more by religious considerations arising from the necessities of Christian faith in his own age. The fact is transparent enough that he regards the conception of the person of Jesus which he himself represents with the highest and purest enthusiasm, and sets before us with perfect freedom in the form of an historical picture, as the only true Christian conception. Nothing will satisfy him short of the confession to which the feeble disciples at last attain, "*My Lord and my God*" (xx. 28). In the writer's time this view of Christ was by no means the only one recognized. On the contrary, many represented him as more human, while a considerable number regarded him as a being who came from a higher world, but who had not actually become a man, but only taken the appearance of humanity in Jesus. It is evident that the writer looked upon both these views as errors which must be overcome. And we may reasonably suppose that he was spurred to the composition of his Gospel by the fact that none of those already existing (and he must at any rate have had our first three) sufficed for his purpose, and that he aimed at securing by means of his own Gospel, with its higher conception of the nature of Christ, a victory for the Church over these very errors. He succeeded in this, not only on account of the high intrinsic value of his work, but also because his representation fell in with the tendency of the age, and because the Church required a Gospel which should speak in loftier language of the person of Jesus—a requirement which may be plainly perceived from Heb. i. 3, Col. i. 15—18, and of which we find some indications at an earlier period, Phil. ii. 6—8.

The above considerations enable us to determine the *class of readers* for which the writer intended his work. It is no manual of information or attractive discourse for non-christians. Indeed no Gospel was written at all for "those who are without" (1 Cor. v. 12, 13). On the other hand, it is by no means written exclusively (see p. 208) for a narrow circle of disciples who had been initiated into secrets to be concealed from others; for although a

distinction is made between the things which Jesus said in parables and those things which he said freely to all (comp. xvi. 25, 29), yet with the departure of the Lord, which is regarded as the condition of the advent of the Spirit, came the hour of complete knowledge *for all* (xvi. 13). Nor, again, does it appear that the writer had only a part of the Church in his mind, say the region immediately surrounding his own home in Asia Minor. On the contrary, the Christ of this Gospel occupies a commanding position in the great history of humanity, and the gaze of the writer is accordingly directed first of all to the union of all believers (xvii. 21, 22), and in the second place to the completion of the flock without reference to nationality (x. 16). He desires to give such a picture of the life and principles of Jesus as will satisfy true "Israelites" (i. 40 sqq.) and longing Greeks (xii. 20) alike. On a foundation which is intentionally made as broad as possible, in the consciousness that he is engaged in a work that marks an era in the history of the world, he writes a spiritual Gospel for all Christendom.

## 2. DATE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The date of the composition of the Fourth Gospel may be pretty accurately determined. That it is one of the latest of the New Testament writings is tolerably evident, in the first place, from its teaching as to the nature of Christ. The Jewish Christians originally regarded Jesus as a man endowed with divine powers, who, being thus endowed, is exalted so that divine attributes may also be assigned to him (Rev. i. 17, 18). Paul regards Jesus as above all else the redeeming manifestation of the second (spiritual or heavenly) man (1 Cor. xv. 45—47). The Fourth Gospel makes the divine nature of the Redeemer the centre and starting-point of his teaching, and from this highest point of view he re-constructs the earthly life of Jesus. In these two views we see the beginning and the conclusion, for a time, of a complete history of the primitive Christian idea of Christ. The interme-

diate stages, which may be traced with tolerable clearness even in detail, represent Christ as “in the form of God,” or as the image of God, in the sense that he is the first fruits of the whole creation, and in fact the mediator and the goal of the whole work of creation (comp. Phil. ii. 6 ; Col. i. 15—18 ; Heb. i. 2, 3, &c.) ; but it is not until the Fourth Gospel appears that we find the complete and distinct conception of Christ as the pre-existent eternal Son of God, who, as being God (i. 1), was before Abraham (viii. 58), who was with God in glory before the foundation of the world (xvii. 5), and through whom all things were made (i. 3). The importance of this step in relation to ecclesiastical opinion as to the nature of Christ is evident. And it is equally evident that such a work could only find its place in the history of the development of Christian thought at a time when, on the one hand, the latter itself demanded a complete logical and definite representation of the Christian idea of salvation, and, on the other hand, the evangelical tradition was not yet fixed, so that the Gospels which already existed did not yet claim to be regarded as absolutely binding.

Further indications of the date of the Fourth Gospel are found in the relation in which it stands to the *Gnostics*, as they are called, i.e. Christians who suffered the moral and religious nucleus of Christianity, diluted in large measure with non-christian elements, to evaporate in fantastic thoughts and images, and who separated the celestial Redeemer Christ from the earthly individuality of Jesus with its human history, in such a way that the whole historical activity of Jesus degenerated into a mere pretence. In the First Epistle of John, the reference to the Gnostics and in fact to the very point just mentioned, is indisputable (1 John ii. 22, iv. 2, 3). The expression “*to become flesh*” (John i. 14), which lies at the very foundation of the Fourth Gospel, and other characteristics—as, for example, the name of *man* which the only-begotten applies to himself (viii. 40), and the statement, in which this Evangelist deviates from the narrative of the Synoptics, that Jesus himself bore his cross (see note on xix. 17),

indicate a conscious opposition to Gnostic errors. Moreover, the whole sphere of thought in which the Evangelist moves shows a striking familiarity with the Gnostic ideas. Hence the sharp opposition between God and the world, above and beneath, light and darkness, the children of God and the children of the devil ; hence also the designation of the Son of God as the only-begotten ; and hence the common use of the words, Father, Logos (Word), Beginning, Life, Truth, Grace, Paraclete, Fulness. These terms point especially to the system of Basilides, which was in its zenith in the time of Hadrian (117—138) and which, there can be no doubt, threw the Christian community into a state of great excitement and fear lest it should be contaminated by his ideas.

The office and the name assigned to the Spirit also point to the same period. It is called “Paraclete” (xiv. 16, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7), i.e. helper or advocate [A.V Comforter], and appears as a substitute for the Son who has returned to the Father, and as the continuuer of his work, while the expectation of the return of Christ retires altogether into the background. All this points to the Montanism which flourished in Asia Minor towards the middle of the second century. The Montanist school clung convulsively to the prophecies of the apostolic age, similarly designating the Spirit Paraclete, but at the same time passionately desiring to see the prophesied end of the world. In contrast to these stormy spiritual impulses, the Fourth Gospel represents the clear and sober influence of the Spirit, which since the departure of the Lord has dwelt with those who are his, and leads them into all truth.

A further indication of the period of the composition of the Fourth Gospel is found in the remarkable fact that it places the death of Jesus on the 14th of the month of Nisan, i.e. the day *before* the great day of the Passover (xviii. 28) (whereas the three first Gospels represent his death as taking place on the day of the feast) ; that the institution of the Lord’s Supper on the occasion of the last paschal supper is entirely set aside, and we find only an account of a farewell meal (on the 13th of Nisan) as the

last token of his love for his disciples (xiii. 1). This is explained by the dispute which arose in Asia Minor in the second century concerning the celebration of the Passover. The Jewish Christians held strictly to the ancient tradition, and, like the Jews, celebrated the Passover on the 14th of Nisan. They appealed for their authority to the Gospel of Matthew and—to the usage of the apostle John. The Pauline Christians would have nothing to do with a Jewish festival (comp. Col. ii. 16, 17). Why keep a Jewish Passover when Christ had been slain for us all as the true paschal lamb (1 Cor. v. 7)? At a later date, towards the end of the second century and in a somewhat different form, this question became of very considerable importance, when Rome advocated the independent celebration of a Christian Easter festival in opposition to the narrow custom of the Jewish Christians of Asia Minor. And we must place the origin of the Fourth Gospel at the beginning of this dispute, seeing in it, as we do, an evident desire to counterbalance the authorities for a paschal feast which was Jewish rather than Christian. The testimony of Matthew is undermined by the testimony of the disciple “whom the Lord loved.” The paschal lamb of the Jews loses all significance, since Jesus is himself the paschal lamb (xix. 36), slain at the very time when the Jews slew their lambs. The parting meal of Jesus and his disciples, so far from being itself the paschal feast, had no connection with it at all. It is evident how the period of its composition explains the remarkable departures of the writer of the Fourth Gospel from a tradition which we cannot suppose to have been unknown to him.

Again, if the prediction of Jesus (v. 43), that the Jews will receive another who *will come in his own name*, is to be interpreted of any definite event, none is more suitable than the rising of the Jews under the emperor Hadrian (130—135 A.D.), when the Messianic pretender, Bar-Cochba, the “Son of the Star,” as he called himself in allusion to Numb. xxiv. 17, succeeded in exciting the Jews to a last desperate struggle, and in sweeping them along with him to destruction. If the reference to this

event is established, then the Fourth Gospel must have been composed between the years 135 and 150. About the year 180, it is referred to in Theophilus and Irenaeus under the name of John. But we find evidence of its use from the year 170 onwards, not only in the Fathers, but even in the Jewish-Christian Gnostic book of the Clementine Homilies (about 170), and indeed even in the heathen opponent of Christianity, Celsus (178). We have no sufficient ground for doubting that Justin Martyr was acquainted with the book (about 160). But when we go further back, we find its use by the Gnostic Basilides altogether uncertain, though, on the other hand, the author of the Shepherd of Hermas (about 150) and the aged Papias of Hierapolis (Euseb. iii. 39) appear to be acquainted with the First Epistle, which is closely connected with the Gospel; and some of the ideas contained in the Epistle of Barnabas (125—130) have such a strong resemblance to this Gospel, that in any case we cannot but regard them as near neighbours.

### 3. AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

In the presence of all the indications enumerated above, that the Fourth Gospel was composed during the second quarter of the second century, it is impossible to suppose that it was written by the apostle John; for John would then have been nearly a century and a half old; this work, with all its intellectual freshness and vigour, full of the thoughts and interests of the second century, dealing so powerfully with the questions which the Church was then called upon to solve, would have been written by him in an old age such as is itself almost unheard of. Moreover, while the Revelation assumes that several of the apostles are already dead (xviii. 20, xxi. 14), Heracleon, writing in the second century, does *not* mention John among the apostles who died a natural death; and Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, speaks of his having been murdered by the Jews in the same manner as his brother James. But there are other and far weightier proofs

that the apostle cannot be the author of the Fourth Gospel. *The one circumstance that the Jewish Christians appealed to the authority of the apostle John in justification of their method of celebrating the paschal festival, while the so-called Gospel of John is distinctly opposed to their custom and their view, is itself decisive.* And again, a comparison of the Gospel with the Revelation is decisive. It is almost universally acknowledged to be impossible to ascribe to the same man a book bearing a Jewish-Christian stamp so plainly as the "Revelation of John," which appeared in Asia Minor about the year 70, and a book so entirely free from Judaism as the Fourth Gospel, which leaves the very question of the Pauline contest with the Law behind it. And what we know of the brother of James from other sources, reminds us more of the Revelation than of the free spirit of the Fourth Gospel. The position which Paul assigns to John (Gal. ii. 9) was taken up by him twenty years after the departure of Jesus. Is it to be supposed that altered circumstances and so-forth had so powerful an effect upon the "Son of Thunder" that the zealot for the law and ceremonial piety became in his extreme old age a direct opponent of the law as a Jewish institution which had entirely lost all meaning for Christians (John i. 17, vii. 22, &c.)?

But how came it that the writer of the Fourth Gospel chose such a "pillar" of Jewish Christianity, represented him as the authority for his thoroughly spiritual conception of the Gospel, and sheltered himself under his name?

The publication of the Revelation written in Asia Minor had contributed not a little to make the name of the apostle John celebrated in those regions, and to subject his memory to the processes by which pious and reverent legends are constructed. We may pass over for the present the question whether the "Revelation" first gave rise to the tradition of John's residence in Asia Minor, or whether it is rather to be regarded as early evidence of the fact that he actually did reside there for some time. In any case, tradition has uniformly delighted to represent this apostle as the last to depart from the earth, and to leave

the community finally bereft of all apostles. The oldest legends which we possess concerning the last of the apostles assign to him characteristics which are purely Judaistic. He stands forth in the memory of the Jewish Christians of Asia Minor as a high-priest bearing the distinguishing gold plate upon his forehead (Exod. xxviii. 36). How natural it was that the Gentile Christians also should endeavour in time to avail themselves of so great an authority, and to represent the last of the apostles encircled with such glory as *their* witness, taking him away, as it were, from their Judaistic opponents, and turning the picture of the zealot for the law into its exact opposite! And they were not without a point of connection at which to attach their own account to the original tradition. This already represented John, with his brother James, who died early, and Peter, as being particularly intimate with Jesus. John was regarded as a friend in whom the Lord had especially confided, and as a pillar of the Church, and this idea was strengthened and confirmed when he was thought of as the bearer of the revelation of those things which should shortly come to pass, and the revelation itself as personally delivered to him by the risen and glorified Christ (Rev. i. 1). But an intimate disciple of Christ, according to the Pauline view, could not be confined within narrow Jewish limits; on the contrary, he must represent a deeper and freer conception of Christianity. It was thus that Pauline Christianity created the John of the Fourth Gospel, who finds a suitable companion in the Peter of the First Epistle of Peter, also the product of the same Pauline spirit. And it was the more urgently driven thus to metamorphose the memory of the Jewish apostle in accordance with its own ideas, inasmuch as Paul himself, who was its proper support and authority, always suffered in the eyes of its opponents from the fact that he had not been an eye-witness of the acts of Jesus, nor an immediate disciple of the Lord. This defect was amply supplied by the disciple who lay in Jesus' bosom. Thus we understand how it was possible for an inhabitant of Asia Minor, writing in the second century, to select the Paulinised

John as the authority for his representation of the acts of Jesus.

Accordingly, the Fourth Gospel has not unfairly been called “the spiritual apocalypse” (*Revelation of John*). The *Revelation* stands undoubtedly in sharp contrast to the Fourth Gospel, not only in its Jewish-Christian tone and its resistance to a Christianity free from the law, but also in its intense expectation of the return of Jesus, which is replaced in the Fourth Gospel by the advent of the Spirit. Nevertheless, it contains some points of which the Gospel avails itself to form a connection between the two. Jesus Christ appears in the *Revelation* as the “faithful witness” (*Rev. i. 5*) ; he is called the “beginning of the creation of God” (*iii. 14*) and the “Word of God” (*xix. 13*). In like manner he appears in the Gospel as bearing witness to that which the Father has shown him (*John iii. 11, 32*) ; and if the phrase, first fruits of the creation of God, is here differently understood, and entirely new ideas are connected with the name “Word of God,” the expressions are still the same, and the preparation of the *Revelation* renders them likely to gain a general acceptance. The work of the seer in the *Revelation* is spoken of as a “testimony” (*Rev. i. 2, xxii. 16*), and in the Fourth Gospel John appears as a “witness” to him who was made flesh (*i. 14, xix. 35*). These resemblances are certainly not accidental, but are consciously produced by the writer in the exercise of his creative art.

While the post-apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel is thus by no means inexplicable, the supposition that it is the work of the apostle John, considering the manner in which the apostle himself is introduced in the Gospel, is altogether improbable. It is almost impossible to suppose that a disciple of the Lord, after the rebuke which Jesus administers in *Matt. xviii. 1 sqq.*, *Mark ix. 34 sqq.*, *Luke ix. 46 sqq.*, could be so presumptuous as to speak of himself simply as the disciple “whom Jesus loved,” or could deliberately thrust upon the reader’s notice the superiority of his own position to that of Peter, as in chapters *xiii.* and *xx.* On the other hand, it is easy to understand how a third party, whose

purpose is to exalt John as highly as possible, can speak of him in this manner. It is scarcely conceivable, again, that any one would bear witness to anything in the fashion that we find in xix. 35. He would rather give his own name, speak in the first person, and give some further assurance that he has spoken the truth. The language here is just that of a writer who wishes to retire, as it were, behind the revered name of an apostle and let the latter appear upon the scene. He wishes to give an impression that he was intimately connected with him, but not that he was himself the apostle.

But the value of the writing is not dependent upon our knowledge of the author's name. The unknown writer has constructed a great and beautiful monument to Jesus and his apostle. And while there is much that is perishable in this book, which has hitherto been over-estimated from an historical and dogmatic point of view, its imperishable value lies in the impression that is made by this religious and philosophical picture, in the stress that is laid upon the personality of Jesus, perfect in religion, marking an era in the history of the world, in the portentous discovery of what was truly eternal and infinite in his work and influence in spite of the historical limits of its first appearance, and finally in the triumphant boldness with which it represents, after a new fashion, to a new century, and indeed to the succession of the centuries, the infinite worth and superiority of Jesus.

And now of the theological conceptions of the writer we know this much: the Evangelist is so much of a theologian and philosopher, that instead of beginning straightway with his history, he opens his work with a statement of his doctrine concerning God and the world. To him, God and the world are, to speak shortly, two opposites which are in some respects eternally exclusive of each other.—God, the one “only true” God (i. 1, x. 29, xiv. 28, xvii. 3), is the Hidden, the Unknown (i. 18, v. 37, vi. 46, 1 John iv. 12); at best we can only call Him Life (v. 26, vi. 57), Spirit (iv. 24), Him who worketh (v. 17).—Opposed to Him, as the dark is opposed to the light (i. 5, iii. 19), the lower to the

higher (viii. 23), stands the earthly world, with its offspring of flesh and blood, its lusts and wickedness (i. 13, iii. 6, 31, viii. 44; 2 John ii. 16, v. 19). The reconciliation of these two infinite opposites is found in the *Logos*, i.e. the “Word” or Speaker of God (iii. 34, v. 38, vi. 63, viii. 37, 43, x. 19, 21, 35, xvii. 8, 14, &c.), which exists from the beginning, is in communion with God, and is itself God, although not *the* God, and having only a life derived from Him (i. 1, 18, v. 26). This is the personal executive power carrying out the designs of God (v. 17, 19, viii. 26, 28, xii. 49), the architect of the world, the light and life of the world (i. 3, 4, 9), though the world, because of its darkness, continually resists the light (i. 5, 10), produces a two-fold offspring of the lower and higher (viii. 23), and from the first supports in the person of the devil the murderer of men and the leader of rebellion against God (viii. 44).

This theology, which is blended most skilfully with the history of Jesus as the *Logos* which has been made flesh and overcomes the world, is no other than the prevailing Jewish theology of that age, which reached its classic termination in Philo, the famous Alexandrian Platonist, a contemporary of Jesus himself, which owes its diffusion in Christendom more to the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and afterwards to the Fathers, than to Paul, and which has supplied the most important supports of the doctrine of the deity of Christ. It is true that the elements of this doctrine of the *Logos* may be found as far back as the Old Testament, where the creative word of God is introduced in Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms, and moreover, that this “Word” is more and more distinctly identified with the “Wisdom” of the latest books, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch and the Wisdom of Solomon, as one personal being, and made the upholder of the life of the world and the nations (comp. Gen. i. 3 sqq., Psalm xxxiii. 6, Isaiah lv. 10 sq., Job xxviii. 12 sqq., Prov. viii. 14 sqq., ix. 1 sqq., Eccl. xxiv., Baruch iii. 9 sqq., Wisd. vii. 22 sqq.); nevertheless, it becomes plainer and plainer that the complete development of this doctrine, the definite

moulding of it amid numerous and to some extent verbal coincidences with the doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, is first found in the doctrine of Philo, with which the amplifications of the Book of Wisdom and the later Jewish literature are more or less closely connected. And indeed the direct use of the very words of Philo on the part of the Fourth Gospel is more than probable.

#### 4. PRINCIPLES OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

On the basis of the views above described is erected a doctrine of salvation, the essential principles of which are as follows :

The gospel is the fulness of the divine revelation. Grace and truth have come into being in all their fulness through Jesus Christ, and have put an end to the law which was given through Moses. Jesus Christ has brought the truth, the words of God himself. He was able to do this because he is not of the earth, but came down from above. He who bears the spirit in himself without measure, has come upon earth and taken upon himself our flesh in order that he may establish the true worship corresponding to the pure spiritual nature of God, and this is brought about chiefly by the witness which he bears to himself as the way, the truth and the life. But his testimony has no prospect of winning all. The human world is divided. Some are of the truth and hear his voice. Others are votaries of evil, blinded servants of Satan, the present powerful prince of the visible world, whom the Son of Man has come to deprive of his kingdom. While, then, the former, by a spiritual union with the manifested Word, receive into themselves eternal life so that they cannot die, the latter, in growing hostility, in which the judging or separating power of the Word is tried and found sufficient, meet with eternal death or destruction. The work of the Incarnate has been completed on the cross, in the sense that the manifestation of his glory has reached its highest point in his departure from the world to the Father, but not in the sense that the divine work of revelation has now terminated. On the contrary, the revelation in the flesh

is only the foundation of a much more direct and spiritual influence of God. The glorified Christ sends, what he could not fully impart while he was "in the flesh," the Spirit, as the divine power which carries on without ceasing the spiritual work in his disciples. And it is only under the unrestricted influence of the Spirit that it is possible to attain the full knowledge of the truth, as the only-begotten had brought it from the Father, and the true and profound union with God which the only-begotten himself enjoyed. This is the meaning of the application of the term "the life" to the Johannine Christ: the contact of humanity with the full stream of divine living power, a contact granted to man through the incarnation of the Son of God, and itself direct, present and never-ceasing.

In i. 11—13, the writer gives us a concise summary of the earthly life of the only-begotten. He comes to his own possession, and by the greater part of those who are his he is not received; but those who do receive him he makes children of God. The *design* and *divisions* of the work itself correspond to this summary even in details. The design of the work is to represent on the one side the manifested Son of God revealing himself ever more and more fully, and on the other side the world and the believers in their relation to his revelation. This representation is completed in three stages. First we have a picture of the Son of God entering into the world as the bearer of perfect grace and truth. We see how his coming is announced, how he then appears and announces himself, and how he is received by the world. This division extends from i. 1 to iv. 54, and is subdivided into two sections, the first of which is introductory. This first section, commonly called the proem (i. 1—18), goes back, as was essential to the fourth Evangelist's representation of Christ, to the position of things before the entry of the Word into flesh, in order that the writer may then set before us this incarnation itself as the great crisis in the revelation of God to man. The second division extends from v. 1 to xii. 50. Here the Redeemer displays his glory in increasing measure and in various directions; but the

further the work of overcoming the world is carried towards its completion, the greater are the difficulties which arise through the more and more definite hostility of the world, culminating at last in the determination to kill him. Now we reach the third stage. His hour has come to depart. And when, as the true paschal lamb upon the cross, he has taken away the sins of the world, and so become the fount of its eternal salvation (xix. 34, 35), he leaves the world to return to the Father—a departure not of humiliation, but of the fullest glorification (xiii. 31, 32). Here the question of the position of the world, which in the prospect of the future winning of *all* (x. 16) itself receives to a certain extent a share of the glorification of Jesus, is thrown more and more into the background, and a new question is brought to the front, that of the relation of Jesus to his own, whom he is leaving, and of their relation to him. Thus this third division, in which lies the central point of the whole, has a more confiding and intimate tone, inasmuch as the writer here lets us see what Jesus is to his own, and especially what he is to the most loving and the most understanding among them, and the relation to him in which they stand and in which they are to stand. It is when he reaches this point that, in the full glow of his religious enthusiasm, the writer gives us what is most entirely his own. This third division extends from xiii. 1 to xx. 31. For chapter xxi. is a later addition. It is evident that the Evangelist concludes his work with xx. 30, 31.

The writer has himself distinguished these three divisions by grouping the different parts of his narrative around three Passovers, which are by no means to be received as definite dates, but the symbolic signification of which must for that very reason be regarded as of all the greater importance (comp. ii. 13, 23, vi. 4, xi. 55, xii. 1, xiii. 1).

# THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN.

## CHAPTER i.

### Verses 1—18. Proem.

The intention of this proem is to show us Jesus as an essential link in the connection between God and the world, as the climax and goal of the whole of the old and new course of the world's development. The form into which this is thrown is an account of the incarnation of the Word in Jesus Christ. The "Word" is regarded as a being occupying an intermediate position between the invisible God and the visible world which is widely separated from God. The Word is a personified instrument by means of which the whole energy of God acts upon the world, and hence the being by whom God reveals himself as working and speaking (v. 17 sqq., iii. 34). It is as this spokesman of God, who is the expression of the Divine will at the same time that he is the image of His being, that he is called the *Word*.

### Verses 1—5.

The Word in relation to God and the world before the incarnation.

1. *In the beginning*: comp. note on xvii. 5. This does not mean that the Word was eternal, and therefore that it was *not made*; see on the contrary v. 26 (xviii. 37).—*With God*, i.e. most intimately connected with God, but yet subject to Him; comp. i. 18 ("in the bosom of the Father") and v. 19.—*The Word was God*; i.e. having a divine nature and essence, divine honour and energy.

2. *The same* should be "This."

3. Whether material things were only formed out of an obscure and confused original material (chaos) under the influence of the Word, or whether they were called into being out of nothing, cannot be decided from these words. The way in which the writer speaks of the world as worthless and separated from God

by its material nature, leads us to suppose that he shares with Philo of Alexandria the first of these opinions.

4. *In him was life*: i.e. the source of all life, both physical and spiritual.—*And the life*: the name of “Life” simply is given to him as the source of life. As such he is moreover the source of *light* to men (comp. ver. 9); there is no knowledge without him.

5. *Comprehended it not* should be “received it not.”

### Verses 6—13.

John sent by God as witness to the true light.

6. *There was a man sent from God*, strictly “a man sent from God was made;” i.e. a man entered into the world.

8. *That light*: “the Light,” both times.

9. Another and probably more accurate translation of this verse is: “The true light which lighteth all men was coming into the world.”

10. *He was in the world*: this must be distinguished from the statement that he “came” in verse 11. He both was and acted as the giver of light and life *before* his “coming,” i.e. before his incarnation.—*And the world, &c.*: i.e. although (he was in the world and) the world was made by him, yet it did not recognize him. Here of course the human world is meant.—*Knew him not* should be “did not recognize him.”

11. “He came to that which was his own, and they who were his own received him not.” Possibly this verse is only an amplification of ver. 10, inasmuch as the world is his own, but it is more probable that the phrase refers to the “own people” of Ps. cxxxv. 4, viz. Israel.

13. The exalted possession of sonship, to which the Light that has appeared leads, is a spiritual possession springing purely from God. There is a birth from God which is not of the flesh (as the descent from Abraham, which the Jews esteemed so highly, was).

### Verses 14—18.

The entering of the Word into humanity, the incarnation and its result.

14. *Was made*: “became.” The entry into the world is more closely defined; it is an *incarnation*. In 1 John iv. 3, the expression “to come in the flesh” is used, and the incarnation is neither

intended to mean nor can mean anything more than this.—*Dwelt*: more exactly “he pitched his tent” i.e. he made the Old Testament symbol of God’s dwelling among his people in the tabernacle of the covenant an actual fact, bringing salvation to us.

**15.** This verse should be rendered “John beareth witness of him, and hath cried aloud, This was he of whom I said, He that cometh after me became before me, for he was before I was.” John bears witness aloud to the greatness of him who has appeared in the flesh (i. 30). He recognizes him as having existed before him.

**16.** “And of his fulness have we all received grace upon grace.” The receipt of superabundant and ever-increasing grace from his fulness is in like manner a testimony on the part of all who are his.

**17.** *By Moses by Jesus Christ*: “through Moses through Jesus Christ.”

#### Verses 19—28.

The forerunner directs the inquiring Jews to him who already stands in their midst.

**21.** According to Jewish expectation, Elijah was to precede the Messiah (Mal. iv. 5). Comp. note on Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 12.—*That prophet* should be “the prophet,” here and in verse 25, i.e. the second Moses (Deut xviii. 15; comp. John vi. 14). John explains to the Jews that he has nothing to do with their expectations.

**24.** The Pharisees are mentioned as the fiercest opponents (xi. 47, xii. 19).

**25.** *That prophet*: see note on verse 21.

**28.** *Bethabara*: probably we should read “Bethany,” distinguished, however, from the place of the same name described in xi. 18, by the words “beyond Jordan.”

#### Verses 29—34.

John bears witness to Jesus as the Lamb of God.

**31.** John baptizes with water as a sign for Israel in order to direct them to the baptism with the spirit.

**32—34.** It is not till after he has borne witness of him that John recognizes Jesus by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him in the form of a dove, a sign that it is he that baptizes with

the Holy Spirit. That Jesus was baptized by John, and that he saw this at the time of the baptism, is not narrated here.

Verses 35—51.

The gathering of the first disciples. A complete reconstruction of Mark i. 16—20.

**39.** The two disciples of John, whose attention has been called by the testimony of their master, wish simply to see where Jesus is to be found; but he at once invites them to him, and the same day they recognize with rapture his Messiahship.—*The tenth hour*: four o'clock in the evening.

**40.** The one of the two disciples who is not named is supposed by many to be John, but without sufficient reason. Such incidental and unobtrusive mention would only be historically probable on the supposition that the Gospel was written by him.

**42.** The knowledge of the name of Simon, like the announcement of his future position as Peter, is to be regarded as a manifestation of the omniscience of Jesus, showing his divine origin (ii. 25). So also vi. 70.

**45.** Nathanael, usually supposed, without sufficient ground, to be Bartholemew, has more recently also been taken to be Matthew, or according to others Matthias. The name, though taken from the Old Testament (see, for example, Numb. i. 8, ii. 5), is only used by the fourth Evangelist, and only in this chapter (comp., however, xxi. 2). The meaning is "God gave him" (comp. vi. 37, xvii. 2, 6, 9), the same as the meaning of the name John, and we might more reasonably suppose that the Evangelist intends here to introduce the beloved disciple, i.e. John. The very significant calling, which plainly corresponds, even in the addition of a name indicating his spiritual nature, to the prominence given to the calling of Simon, harmonizes admirably with this view. If this is correct, we may then suppose that the unnamed disciple in vv. 35, 40, is James, the brother of John, whom the Evangelist cannot entirely pass over, considering how closely tradition connected him with John and Peter. But by deliberately omitting his name, he reduces him to an inferior position, and separates him from John, who was celebrated in the tradition of the second century, together with Philip, as the apostle of Asia Minor. It is in consequence of this connection

between the two that they are here united in their entry into the circle of disciples.

**47.** *An Israelite indeed*: truly an Israelite, in opposition to those who only pretended to be so, “the Jews,” who are designated children of him who was a murderer and a liar from the beginning (viii. 44).

**49.** This confession is usually wrongly regarded as being made in a Jewish sense. According to the Evangelist, Jesus is the king of Israel, but not the king of the Jews (xii. 12—16, xviii. 33 sq.).

**51.** Nathanael receives the significant promise, reminding us of ver. 42, that he shall see “greater things.” They will see Jacob’s dream of the ladder from heaven fulfilled in Jesus, heaven opened over the Son of Man who has descended from heaven (Dan. vii. 13, 14), the ministering angels of God ascending and descending over him in whom as the true seed of Jacob all the tribes of the earth are blessed (Gen. xxviii. 14).

## CHAPTER ii.

### Verses 1—11.

The sign of the turning of water into wine.

**1.** *On the third day*: reckoned from the gathering of the disciples (i. 35); for the scene with Peter (i. 42, 43) must be regarded as taking place on the first day, and the scene with Nathanael on the second.

**4.** He will not act according to human wishes and considerations, but simply for the execution of the Divine counsel, which has its appointed hour for everything.

**6.** *After the manner of the purifying*: for the purpose of cleansing the hands and the vessels, according to Jewish custom, before and after a meal.

**11.** The first part of this verse should be “This Jesus did at Cana in Galilee as the beginning of his signs.” The stress laid upon this miracle as the first (in opposition to Mark i. 23—27) shows that to the writer of the Gospel himself it is not merely the marvellous production of a physical phenomenon, but a miracle which is intended to represent symbolically the nature of him who thus appears among men, his “glory” and the purpose of his coming. Like almost all the other miracles of the Fourth Gospel, this first one is a symbol of his redeeming work. He

is the true Bridegroom (iii. 29). He is with his own as at a wedding. They rejoice with him until he is taken from them (xvi. 33; comp. Matt. ix. 15). He has for them abundance of the best wine which makes the heart rejoice, viz. words of eternal life (vi. 28). This powerful drink takes the place of the water of spiritless Jewish ceremonies (the pitchers for purification, ver. 6).

### Verses 12—24.

The purification of the temple = Mark xi. 15—19, but here occupies a totally different place in the life of Jesus.

**12.** According to Matt. ix. 1, Capernaum is the head quarters of Jesus. The Fourth Gospel only represents him as staying a few days there; he hastens on to Jerusalem, the proper place for his manifestation of himself.

**14.** See note on Matt. xxi. 12.

**17.** See Ps. lxix. 9.—*Hath eaten me up*, should be “will consume me.”

**20.** The unhistorical character of this speech of Jesus is self-evident, for it was impossible for him to be understood either by the Jews or by his own disciples. In fact, he could not but be altogether misunderstood by them. On the other hand, we can easily see how a writer who is so fond of symbolism as our author, might connect the cleansing of the temple with the destruction and restoration of his body, which is also a holy tabernacle (i. 14), and might find in the latter a sign of his authority for the former.

**23.** *Believed in his name*: i.e. on account of the signs. It is a case of that belief because of miracles which he held in such slight esteem. Hence he does not entrust himself to them, and does not call them to him. The cleansing of the temple is also a symbolic transaction full of meaning. It expresses still more strongly the abolition of the Jewish worship by the Word which has been manifested. Comp. iv. 21—23 (Acts vi. 14).

## CHAPTER iii.

### Verses 1—21.

The exclusiveness and reserve of the chief of the Jewish rulers.

**1.** Nicodemus does not appear in the Synoptics. In the Fourth Gospel he appears again in vii. 50, xix. 30. In the Talmud we

find the name Nakdim (=The Excellent) as the title of a Rabbi Boni. It is possible that the Evangelist has used this name in a Greek form for the pattern representative of the Pharisees.

2. He comes at night because of the anger and hostility of the other Pharisees towards Jesus (iv. 1—3, vii. 52).

3. *Born again* should be “born from above.” The knowledge of the kingdom of God requires a spiritual nature, a birth from above, i.e. produced by God and springing from the world above. In this saying the words of Mark x. 15 are metamorphosed into a new Johannine form.

5. Jesus gives a more detailed explanation of his first answer: A man can only enter the kingdom of God by being born *of water and of the spirit*: water being the symbol of purification (in baptism), and the spirit (of God) being the renewing power.

6. Earthly and sinful human nature can only produce its like. Only birth by the spirit can bring with it the spiritual nature, i.e. full and true life.

7. *Born again* should be “born from above.”

8. *The wind bloweth where it listeth so is every one that is born of the spirit*: In the original there is a play upon the word “pneuma,” which means both “wind” and “spirit.” The wind is beyond our control, and though we know its effects, we know neither its source nor its goal. So also the birth from the spirit, having its source solely in the will of God and leading to the higher world, is hidden in mystery and known only in its effects.

9. By this question Nicodemus shows himself to be a man entirely without experience of the influence of the spirit. Compare the contrast in ver. 11, where Jesus speaks in the name of himself and of those who believe in him.

10. *A master* should be “the master” [i.e. teacher].

12. Birth from the spirit is spoken of as belonging to the earth, inasmuch as it takes place in man. But Jesus could also say of heavenly mysteries belonging entirely to the other life, that these spiritual things must be *believed*, i.e. the testimony to them must be received as it comes from God.

13. *Which is in heaven*: This does not mean, who now dwells in heaven, or who has been there, but whose nature and life is in the higher world (comp. viii. 23).

14. Comp. Numb. xxi. 6—9.—*Lifted up*: first of all upon the

cross ; but the cross is for him a true uplifting, inasmuch as it brings him to heaven, showing at the same time the way to the Father, and confirming the statement that he descended from heaven.

16. It is upon the Son as the only Son sent out from the Father that every one must believe who will not be lost but will have eternal life. The longer the speech of Jesus continues, the more it passes into a meditation of the Evangelist.

19—21. The Fourth Evangelist regards *the judgment*, not as a sudden and external event, but as a spiritual process which began with the entrance of the Light, i.e. the Son of God, into the world. For it is by this that the hatred of the light, which testifies to the love of evil, has been manifested.

19. *Condemnation* : “judgment.”—*Light darkness light* : “the light the darkness the light.”

20. *Lest his deeds should be reproved* should be “lest he should be convicted of his deeds.”

21. *That they are wrought in God* : “because they have been wrought in God.”

#### Verses 22—36.

John’s final testimony, before his departure, addressed to his unreceptive disciples.

22. *Came* : i.e. from Jerusalem.

24. In contradiction of Mark i. 14.

25. This verse should read : “Then there arose on the part of John’s disciples a dispute with a Jew concerning purification.” They dispute about purification by water, i.e. as to which is the right one, looking with jealousy upon Jesus’ baptism, regarding it also as a baptism simply with water. (See i. 33.)

29. The community belongs to Jesus as his bride. The marriage-day has been depicted in ii. 1—11. And John hears with delight the bridegroom’s cry of joy. His own joy is complete, for the desired hour is come.

30. It is reasonable that the lesser light should vanish in the light of the Sun that has now arisen. The one must take precedence of all others (ver. 31).

31—33. These verses should read, “He that cometh from above is above all. He that springs from the earth is of the earth and speaketh of the earth. He that cometh from heaven

testifieth what he hath seen and heard ; and no man receiveth his testimony. But he who hath received his testimony hath set his seal to it that God is true.”

**31.** He that springeth from the earth hath an earthly nature and speaketh in an earthly way, i.e. so that he cannot pass the limits of the earthly.

**33.** Here, again, the words of the speaker pass imperceptibly into a meditation of the writer (see note on ver. 16).

**34.** Only God’s envoy speaks the pure and full divine word, out of the unmeasured fulness of the spirit.

## CHAPTER iv.

### Verses 1—42.

The promising Samaritan field of labour.

**1.** Jesus avoids the hatred and jealousy of the Pharisees.

**5.** *Sychar* must be Shechem (Gen. xlviii. 22 ; Josh. xxiv. 32), but it is difficult to say what is the cause of the curious change of name. It cannot be supposed to be a mistake on the part of the Evangelist, for the name of Shechem was familiar enough from the Old Testament, with which he is well acquainted. The meaning of the name Sychar is “Drinking Town,” and it may have been an ironical name given by the Jews. It is more probable, however, that the Evangelist is alluding to Is. xxviii. 1—16, and intends to represent the Samaritan town as sunk in sensuality, as a place of heathen debauchery. It would then stand as parallel with the symbolic names Nathanael (i. 48), *Aenon* = “Place of Water” (iii. 23), Bethesda (v. 2), Siloam (ix. 7).

**6.** *The sixth hour*, i.e. the hour of noon.

**12.** *Art thou greater*, and canst thou consequently give us better water ?

**18.** The reference to the polluted life of the Samaritan woman is probably to be understood, in accordance with the Evangelist’s usual manner, not only individually but also symbolically of the Samaritan worship in earlier times (five heathen deities, 2 Kings xvii. 24—41). Afterwards they served Jehovah, but they are not lawfully wedded to him, for according to 2 Kings xvii. 34, they do not keep the law as they ought.

**20.** If the explanation of the writer’s meaning which we have

just given be correct, it will also explain the turn which the conversation now takes.

22. Here we have the same thought as in Rom. iii. 2, ix. 4, 5. The latter passage seems to have been in the writer's mind.

23. This verse, like the preceding, has a parallel in Rom. xii. 1, 2.

24. *God is a spirit* should be “God is spirit.” God is free from everything material involving imperfection.

34. *My meat*: that which fills and satisfies me.

35, 36. The word *already* at the end of 35 belongs to 36, so that we should read, “Lift up your eyes and look upon the fields, for they are white to harvest, and already the reaper receiveth his wages,” &c.

35—38. At the time of sowing they cheered themselves with the proverbial saying, that the harvest was only four months distant. Here in the spiritual world the fields are already ripe for the harvest; the full harvest is close at hand. Under the figure of the rich first harvest in Samaria, the Evangelist represents the beginning and the pledge of the great approaching harvest on Samaritan (Acts viii. 5 sq.) and heathen ground generally, where the workers soon will only have to reap what other men, John, Jesus, the first apostles (and perhaps also Paul, the mighty pioneer in the conversion of the heathen, may here be referred to), have laboured in sowing. Thus we find an expression of joy at the spread of the gospel in non-Jewish regions placed in the mouth of Jesus.

40. While he is compelled to depart from Judea, he is invited to remain in Samaria. His own country, and even his Galilean home, do not know how to value him as these strangers do, with whom he tarries but a couple of days.

41, 42. The first imperfect belief, resting only on the fact of his superhuman knowledge, speedily deepens, and they can joyfully confess that they believe directly his word which they have found to be divine.

#### Verses 45—48.

The Galileans receive him, and thus appear to greater advantage than the Judeans, but they receive him only for the sake of the signs that they have seen him perform at Jerusalem. They keep desiring signs and ever new signs, and can never rise above

this paltry belief in signs. Even the nobleman, who represents the highest Jewish society in Galilee, cannot pass beyond it until the miraculous sign itself has been demonstrated to him even to the very hour. He is blamed (and similar blame attaches also to the Galileans generally), not for desiring miraculous help, but for asking Jesus to come down with him, as though it were impossible to conceive of any cure without this physical means. His power is non-existent to them unless there is something they can see and lay hold of; whereas, blessed are they who see not and yet believe (xx. 29). [The word here rendered *nobleman* is very vague, and simply means “one attached to the king or the court.” Luther has rendered it by an equally vague term in German. It probably signifies an officer, civil or military, or perhaps simply a retainer at the court of Herod.]

### Verses 47—53.

A reconstruction of Matt. viii. 5—13 = Luke vii. 1—10.

**54.** The third miracle which the Evangelist narrates as having taken place in Galilee is the feeding of the multitude which follows (ch. vi.). Corresponding to these three are three others, of which the scene is laid in Jerusalem (ch. v. ix. xi). We should notice the position of the Samaritans, with their readiness to receive the gospel, between the unimpressionable representatives of the law in Jerusalem and the Galileans who cannot rise above a faith which rests merely upon signs; and similarly the position of the Samaritan woman, who is so soon converted, between the unintelligent Nicodemus and the officer of the king whom it is so difficult to raise to real faith.

## CHAPTER V.

Jesus manifests himself in Jerusalem as the Lord of the Sabbath, and as the imitator of the Father in divine works.

**1.** *A feast*: It is evident that the Evangelist does not intend to fix the date.—*Of the Jews*: Jesus does not take part in the feast as a Jew joining in its celebration, but he makes it an opportunity for manifesting himself to many.

**2.** *Sheep market* should be “sheep gate.”—*Which is called* should be “with the surname.”—There is no mention anywhere else of any pool called Bethesda. The Evangelist speaks of a

“surname” in distinction from the proper name. Probably he invented the surname himself in order to indicate how the place was made a “house of mercy” by the act of Jesus.

**3.** So far as we know, there was no pool in Jerusalem which served as a medicinal bath. There were only fountains and wells, or springs built in so as to form cisterns containing the springs. The spring of Gihon which Hezekiah thus enclosed (2 Chron. xxxii. 30), now known as the Fountain of the Virgin, was popularly regarded as especially mysterious. Its red colour and the rising and falling of the water excited the imagination. The steps were thus transformed into porches, and it was natural enough to attribute the moving of the water to heavenly powers, and to suppose that it had a healing efficacy.

**3, 4.** The second part of ver. 3 and the whole of ver. 4 (*waiting for whatsoever disease he had*) are probably an interpolation.

**5—9.** Reconstruction of Mark ii. 1—12.

**17.** Notice the violent and intentional denial of the ground on which the observance of the day of rest was based (Gen. ii. 2), which was of Jewish origin, but had passed into Christianity.

**18.** The accusation of making himself equal with God, he meets by the statement that he does nothing without the Father (vv. 19, 30), that the power which he has is given by the Father (20), and that the Father is his example in all that he does (19). This power, however, extends to the raising of the dead (21) and the execution of the judgment (22, 27, 30) as proper to his Messianic office.

**25.** Here a spiritual resurrection is spoken of; but in vv. 28, 29 follows the resurrection at the last day.

**29.** *Damnation*: “judgment.”

**34.** He only appeals to the human testimony of John in order to afford them a tangible ground for belief.

**35.** Ye have played childishly with his light, instead of seriously availing yourselves of it.

**36.** Here we have the key to the interpretation of the miracle of Bethesda, which stands like a vignette at the head of the discourse of Jesus to which it gives occasion. All the miracles which follow occupy similar positions.

**37.** God is spirit (iv. 21), but the Evangelist does not consider that this excludes the possibility of speaking of a *shape* of God.

39. You think (though erroneously as far as your ideas are concerned) that you have found in the Scriptures the way of life. You would have found it if you knew that they testify of me.

44. To the charge that he makes himself equal to God, he replies by charging them with seeking false honour, not that which is with God, but that which comes from men.

### CHAPTER vi.

Jesus reveals himself as the true bread come from heaven.

1. This verse should read, "After these things Jesus departed into the region beyond the Sea of Galilee before Tiberias."

2—21. A reconstruction of Mark vi. 32—52.

3. *Went up into a mountain*, should be "went upon the mountain." The expression "upon the mountain" does not, however, refer to a definite or well-known mountain. The gospel tradition lays the scene of most of the especially significant acts in the life of Jesus "upon the mountain" (Matt. v. 1, xvii. 1, xxvi. 30).

11. *And when set down*, should be, "And after he had blessed them he divided them among them that were set down," &c.

14. *That prophet*: the second Moses, who according to the rabbinical teaching was to be expected to repeat the feeding of the people with manna.

15. [*A mountain*: "the mountain," as in ver 3.]

19. *Furlongs*: strictly "stadia." [The stadium was 202 yards, or eighteen yards less than a furlong.] 25—30 stadia would be about three miles. Hence they were already in the middle of the lake, and we must not suppose that Jesus was walking on the shore, but upon the waves.

21. Jesus delivers his own swiftly and surely from storms and danger, having previously been near them with his help though invisible. This scene on the lake seems also to be distinctly intended to serve the purpose of an interlude between the miraculous feeding of the multitude and the discourse upon the true bread, in which his body appears free from all coarse materialism, so that we may not take what follows about eating his flesh in a material sense (comp. ver. 52).

22. *Stood* should be "had remained."—*Was* should be "had been."

**26.** Jesus accuses them of more than a mere desire of miracles, viz. sensual greed. Hence in ver. 27 they are directed to endeavour to obtain imperishable food.

**27** *Sealed*: i.e. given him signs to confirm his authority, e.g. the feeding of the people which had just taken place, and which was to direct their thoughts to the true bread which had come from heaven.

**32, 33.** *That bread* should be “the bread.” Not the manna of Moses, but he who came down from heaven, who is to bring life to the world, is the bread of God. And such he openly declares himself to be, ver. 35.

**39.** *At the last day*: This is most probably a later addition. It disturbs the sense of raising up spiritually, which alone is suitable here.—The same is the case with the addition, *And I will raise him up at the last day*, in vv. 40, 44, and again in ver. 54, where the addition distinctly interferes with the connection of what precedes with what follows.

**40.** The belief on the Son and the spiritual eating of the true bread are evidently regarded as one and the same thing.

**48.** *That bread*: “the bread.”

**50.** *This*: Jesus himself.

**51.** Another characteristic of the true bread is, that it is a living bread, which is therefore capable of producing eternal life and preserving from destruction.

**51—56.** In these verses the way in which Jesus is the bread is stated, viz. by the surrender of his flesh. The harsh expression, that he gives his flesh to eat, the very harshness of which forces us to a spiritual interpretation, is straightway introduced with the greatest emphasis (vv. 51, 53, 54, 55, 56). No doubt there is at the same time an allusion to the symbol of the Lord’s Supper.

**55.** *Meat indeed* should be “true (real) meat.”—*Drink indeed* should be “true (real) drink.”

**57.** *By the Father*: i.e. from Him as the source.—*He that eateth me*: to eat him and to eat his flesh are the same.

**60.** *Hard*: for those who understand his language carnally. These are they whom the Father does not draw (ver. 44), even though they be disciples (ver. 61).

**62.** *The offence*, or stumbling-block, will be removed when the Son of Man returns to heaven.

63. My words are to be understood spiritually. Understood carnally, they do not give life.—*Speak* should be “have spoken.”

65. *Except it were*: “except it be.”

66—69. A division takes place even among the twelve (70, 71). A reconstruction of Mark viii. 27—33.

68. *The words*: “words.”

69. *That Christ, the Son of the living God*, should be “the holy one of God.” See note on x. 36.

71. *Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon*, should be “Judas, son of Simon, of Karioth.”

#### CHAPTER vii.

The testimony of Jesus in Jerusalem as to the place whence he comes and whither he goes, and the reception with which his testimony meets.

2. The Feast of Tabernacles, which was at the same time both a harvest thanksgiving and a commemoration of Israel’s dwelling in tents during the journey through the wilderness, falls in the autumn. Hence the Evangelist supposes that Jesus has remained for half a year in retirement in Galilee.—Jesus testifies to his people at this festival who it is that has pitched his tent among them, viz. one sent from God (vv. 16 sq.). The writer regards the Feast of Tabernacles and the dwelling in tents as pointing symbolically to him who was to come, who was to “pitch his tent” [A.V “dwell”] in the flesh (i. 14). If, then, they will celebrate their Feast of Tabernacles aright, they must believe on him, whereas they actually do just the contrary. This may explain why it is that the Evangelist connects the appearance in Jerusalem with this particular festival, and why he specially names it, while in v. 1 he speaks simply of “a feast of the Jews.”

3. Hitherto only one striking miracle has taken place in Judea (see ver. 21), viz. the healing narrated in v. 5—9. And so there also he must show works which may serve as his credentials to those who are or desire to be his disciples, as he had done in Galilee. From this time Jesus actually displays his miraculous powers only in Judea. The demand here must be understood to be caused by the dissatisfaction felt by his brothers in blood, which itself springs from their want of faith (ver. 5). They are annoyed to see so many falling away and forsaking him (vi. 66), and defend their doubt as to his divine mission on this ground.

**4.** The signs in Galilee had been given, comparatively speaking, *in secret*, Jerusalem being regarded as the only place where they could properly be said to take place *openly*. Hence all the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem are made to take place at times when festivals are being held.

**6.** I cannot do it before the time appointed according to the counsel of God. You can choose your own time, having nothing to fear from the world.

**8.** *I go not up yet* should be “I go not up.”—We must not suppose here that there is a sudden change of purpose for which there would be no ground. He does not go up in the ordinary way, as other men. Assuming an appearance under which he is not recognized by those who have come up to the feast (ver. 25), until he is made known to them by his mention of the healing of the man who had been diseased thirty-eight years, he suddenly appears in Jerusalem, where his enemies at first seek for him in vain. Not only in a secret but in a positively mysterious manner (comp. vi. 25), he is suddenly there. And this appearance, without any one knowing how or whence he is come, is intended to show the people of Jerusalem that they are altogether wrong in their assertion in ver. 27; for so mysterious a removal into their midst ought to be a sufficient proof for them, shadowing forth, as it were, the fact that he was sent from God.

**11—13.** *The Jews*: i.e. the zealots for the law, wish to kill him and make preparations for so doing (vv. 30, 32). The multitude who are despised by the zealots (ver. 49) are divided (40—44).

**15.** *Letters* = learning generally.

**16.** Jesus declares the substance of his teaching to have been received directly from God.

**20.** *Thou hast a devil*: i.e. “Thou art possessed.”—*Who goeth about to kill thee*: The people say this because they do not recognize him as Jesus the Galilean.

**21.** The meaning is, not that Jesus has only performed one sign in Judea (comp. ii. 23, iii. 2, vii. 31), but rather that he has so far confined himself to one extraordinary sign which has astonished them all.

**27.** One of the opinions of the Jews concerning Christ was, that no one would know whence he came.

28. He who has sent me, from whom I went forth, is the true (sender), unknown indeed to you, who has a right to send his messenger into the world, and gives him the power to execute the purposes for which he is sent.

32. A distinct attempt is now made to lay hold upon him, but they are powerless, under some invisible restraint (comp. v. 30, 44, viii. 20), because his hour is not yet come (ver. 33, and also viii. 59).

34. Jesus announces his speedy departure, his return to his home.

35. *The Gentiles* should be “the Greeks.”

38. Comp. Is. lviii. 11. This figure is used in connection with the figure of drinking (ver. 37). The water which he gives will not only satisfy, but will become as streams proceeding from him.

41. *Shall Christ come* should be “ought Christ to come.”

42. The people speak of the seed of David and of Bethlehem. It is possible that the Evangelist is willing to let the descent from David pass as a genuine sign, and only regards the coming from Bethlehem, which as a village is in no way superior to Nazareth, as a misunderstanding. But it is also possible that he only acknowledges the descent from David in a spiritual sense.

50. Nicodemus appears here, not as a believer, not even as half believing, but only as a lawyer who is very particular about the law, and who therefore seems just and fair as compared with his fellows who are blinded with hatred. We have here a companion piece to Acts v. 34—42, which seems indeed to have been in the Evangelist’s mind. The figure of the Pharisee who gives comparatively the greatest honour to the truth, serves to render more striking the dark hostility of the “high-priests and Pharisees” (vii. 32), the main representatives of Judaism.

#### Verses vii. 53—viii. 11.

The defence of the adulteress. An ancient interpolation, foreign to our Evangelist, interrupting the connection of the discourses of Jesus without any justification, and probably inserted here *à propos* of viii. 15, 16. Comp. Luke xxi. 37, 38.

## CHAPTER viii.

1. *Unto* should be “upon.”

5. Stoning was the penalty only in a special case. Here it is taken to be the general penalty for adultery.

6. *That they might have to accuse him*: that they might find some contradiction of the law to accuse him of, his tenderness towards sinners being known to them. The writing on the ground may perhaps be meant to signify the decision which he had already arrived at not to allow her to suffer the penalty. Comp., however, Jer. xvii. 13.

7. Jesus, by awakening the guilty consciences of his opponents, compels them to carry out his own merciful decision.

9. *Being convicted by their own conscience* should be omitted.

## Verses 12—59.

.Jesus declares himself as the light of the world, which guides into the true freedom, and meets with the most hostile misunderstanding.—Jesus, the light of the world, is the prevailing thought throughout the whole of the controversy contained in this chapter.

12. *The light of life*: Life consists in perception.

13. They misinterpret his own saying (v. 31) and turn it against him. There he disclaims the right to bear witness alone of himself. But it is not he alone who bears witness of himself.

14. Of course he may also bear witness of himself, and his witness in his own case is valid and true, because he declares from his own deepest consciousness that which they do not know, and which no man can know without his testimony.

15. Your condemnation of me is determined by what is visible, by appearances alone.

16. I alone am capable of giving a true judgment, because I am not alone, but am one with the Father.

17. *True* should be “valid.”

19. Comp. xiv. 7—9.

20. The treasury is probably chosen as the place for this speech for the sake of the contrast. There they bring to their God their earthly offering of money, and yet they say that they have the true (spiritual) God for their father.

22. The question of the Jews is to be understood ironically.

23. He declares his descent from the higher world, there being two worlds, a heavenly, invisible, real world, and an earthly (lower), visible and unreal one. Comp. p. 206.

24. *That I am he*: viz. the light of the world (ver. 12). So also in ver. 28.

25, 26. *Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning*, should be “That which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning.” The answer to the question, Who I am, forms the substance of my whole speech, of all my public utterances from the beginning (i.e. not simply the beginning of his career as the Messiah, but the beginning of his work of revelation generally, so that the prophecies of the Old Testament, as proceeding from him, are also comprehended in “that which he has spoken”). It forms “also” the substance of that which I have spoken to you. (We may supplement these verses somewhat as follows: “It is the question, Who I am, that reveals the spirits of men in all ages. When it is answered, sentence is passed in the souls of men. And do ye drag me before your judgment-seat ?”) It is for me to censure and to judge many things in you. As for my own defence, that matters not. He who has sent me is true, and I speak (only) what I have heard, and therefore pure divine truth.

28. The lifting up signifies, in the first place, the lifting up upon the cross; but this itself is the way in which he is lifted up into heaven. See note on iii. 14.—[*I am he*: see ver. 24.]

30—32. Belief is here (30) simply giving attention and credence to his words; for it is only by continuing in his word (31), and thus standing in a practical relation to him, that they can become true disciples, and this leads (32) to the knowledge of the truth, and through the knowledge of the truth to freedom.

31. *My disciples indeed*: better, “in truth my disciples.”

33. The Jews who had “believed” him do not attain this practical relation; they continue in their carnal satisfaction in their boast that they are Abraham’s children, and as such are free-born.

34. From Rom. vi. 16 sqq.

35. As slaves, you cannot remain in the father’s house. But the son who is at home in the father’s house can make you truly free, so that you may remain in the house.

**38.** *That which ye have seen with your father,* should be “that which ye have heard from your father.”

**41.** Jesus has dispelled their boast that they are the children of Abraham. They now fall back upon another assertion, that they have God for their father, and this not only in name, while they really have another father; they have one father, viz. God.

**42.** This boast also he dispels. They lie, as is manifest from the position which they take up in regard to him and his word (42, 43). Rather is the devil their father, as their deeds show. They are like him who was a murderer and a liar from the beginning.

**43.** *Because ye cannot hear,* should be “because ye are intolerant of.”

**44.** [*Ye will do*: i.e. “Ye desire to do.”]—*Abode not* should be “standeth not.”—*The father of it* should be “the father of the liar.”—*From the beginning*: i.e. from the beginning of the world and of human history.—*Of his own*: in contrast to him who speaks only what he hears from the Father, viz. the Son of God.

**46.** *Sin*: viz. sin against the truth, i.e. lies.

**48.** *A Samaritan*: one sunk in heresy and ignorance, who is unfit for pure Jewish fellowship.—*Hast a devil*: i.e. “art possessed.”

**49.** *I have not a devil*: i.e. “I am not possessed.”

**52.** It here becomes perfectly evident that when they accuse him of having a devil in him, they mean that he is insane. They regard it as a sign of insanity that he should give himself out to be greater than Abraham. Comp. x. 20.

**54.** *Honour honour honoureth*, should be “glorify glory glorifieth.”

**56.** *To see my day*: i.e. to see me in my incarnation. Abraham saw this day while he was still alive on earth, saw it, that is to say, in faith (comp. Rom. iv., Gal. iii. 6 sqq., Heb. xi.), when the promise of God was given to him that his family should be the bearer of the divine system of salvation in humanity (Gen. xvii.).

**57.** The Jews suppose that he speaks of an actual experience, and thereby asserts himself to have been a contemporary of Abraham.

**58.** See p. 197.

## CHAPTER ix.

## Verses 1—41.

Jesus, giving sight to a man born blind, shows himself as the light of the world.

1. This miracle has not only a chronological but also an essential connection with the speeches which precede (comp. viii. 12, ix. 5).

3. There is no reason to suppose that Jesus here intends to deny that such defects may ever be traced to the guilt of the individual who suffers from them, or of others (comp. v. 14). He only says that this particular case has a special purpose, the manifestation of God's action by means of the significant and marvellous cure (comp. xi. 4).

5. The claim to this title has no force in connection with the healing of the blind which he is about to perform, unless the latter is understood figuratively and reveals him as the light of the world.

6. These steps are not intended to make the healing natural or the miracle less. The miracle is still a simple act of omnipotence, but it is to be most vividly set before us. The type of the whole proceeding is found in Mark vii. 33—35.

7. We should read here and in ver. 11, "Go and wash thyself in Siloam." The interpretation of the name is added for the purpose of giving to the pool of Siloam a figurative reference to him who is truly sent from God, who must wash and cleanse us.

8. *Blind*: "a beggar." [So the best MSS. and editions.]

16. Notice, again, how the breaking of the Jewish Sabbath is again (as in v. 10—16) regarded as a valid argument against his having been sent by God, whereas it is really an argument in its favour.

18. The Jews are compelled inch by inch, in spite of all resistance, to acknowledge the miracle. Hence the long hearing of the case. But at the same time it is evident that they are resolved from the first not to acknowledge Christ nor to tolerate belief in him (vv. 16, 22, 34).

21. *He shall speak for himself* should be "He will himself give information about himself."

30. The blind man must teach them, even before he himself attains belief (vv. 36, 38), that an act of a kind so unheard of (32)

can only come from God, and can only be performed by one who does God's will, and therefore that there can be no doubt whence Jesus is (33).

**38.** He who has been made to see, attains also complete spiritual vision through belief in the "Lord."

**39.** This conclusion removes all doubt as to the symbolical meaning of the miracle. We have here the result: the action of the "Light of the world" in the world is represented by a physical miracle; it makes the blind to see, but at the same time those who see are blinded by their resistance to it.

**41.** Were you but blind without guilt! But in your pride you claim to see and therefore reject the true light. That is guilty blindness, which is not healed; it is sin and remains.

#### CHAPTER X.

Jesus as the one door that leads to salvation, and as the good divine shepherd.

##### Verses 1—10.

Jesus the one door of salvation. An application of Matt. vii. 13, 14; as he is the way, so he is also himself the door.

**1.** The fold must be understood to refer to the divine ordinances in Israel, as in the case of the vineyard with hedge and tower in Matt. xxi. 33. The entrance to salvation was through Christ even before he came into the world, inasmuch as he prepared salvation beforehand, and the Old Testament revelation is essentially his (i. 10).

**2.** He who desires to be a true shepherd to the souls that belong to God's pasture, must seek an entrance into the heart through him who is the mediator of every true revelation. He who follows not this way is the very opposite to a shepherd, he is a thief and a robber. Comp. ix. 22.

**3.** The sheep belong not to those who feed them, but to God, and to the shepherds appointed by him (ver. 12). There are, however, also sheep which are not his "own," i.e. which only bear his name. Comp. Ezek. xxxiv. 20—22.

**5.** This is evidently a warning against false teachers put into the mouth of Jesus. Hence the verbs are in the future tense.

**8.** *Before me:* without availing themselves of the door, and therefore by violence. Comp. Ezek. xxxiv. 2—10.

**9.** This verse does not refer to the shepherds especially, but is general in its application.

**10.** *More abundantly*: “abundantly.”

### Verses 11—18.

The good shepherd. An allegory after Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24.

**12.** *The wolf*: comp. Ezek. xxxiv. 8.—A warning to the shepherds of the Christian communities, placed in the mouth of Jesus (comp. ver. 5).

**16.** A glance at those who are to come to the faith from among the Gentiles. They come not from a fold, as do those out of Israel, but they are “scattered sheep” (xi. 52). Jews and Gentiles appear here to be placed on a complete equality with regard to their admission.—*There shall be one fold*: “there shall be one flock.” [So all MSS. and editions. “Fold” here seems to have arisen simply from carelessness on the part of the English translators.]

**18.** *This commandment* should be “this commission,” and refers not only to ver. 18, but to the whole passage, 12—18.

### Verses 19—21.

The result of this speech of Jesus.

### Verses 22—42.

The divine dignity of the good shepherd.

**22.** We can scarcely doubt that the time of the feast of the consecration of the temple is purposely selected in connection with the substance of these speeches of Jesus. For now is Israel’s opportunity to celebrate the true consecration of the temple, when the Son of God has appeared in the flesh and walks in the sanctuary of his people.

**24.** [*Make us to doubt*: lit. “excite our souls,” i.e. probably, excite us by vague hopes and expectations.]

**25.** *Ye believed not*: “ye believe not.”

**27—29.** Here we see how the Evangelist, in spite of the change of time and place, has in his mind all the time the same train of thought which he has been following from the beginning of the chapter.

**30.** Not only is emphasis laid here upon the inner relation of the Son to the Father, but also the charge (ver. 33) is met, that

Jesus being a man makes himself God, i.e. places himself upon an equality with God.

**35.** In Ps. lxxxii. 6, the kings are called sons of God, or, what is the same thing, gods, because they reign in the name and by the authority of God.

**36.** The name is allowed to those to whom the (condemnatory) word of God applies. Will not you allow it to be used of him whom God has chosen as his own messenger to the world?—*Sanctified*: i.e. chosen, selected. Comp. vi. 69.

**41, 42.** Here the overpowering effect of Jesus' declaration of himself upon the unprejudiced is represented, in contrast to the deadly hostility which his testimony arouses in the zealots for the law.

## CHAPTER xi.

### Verses 1—44.

In raising Lazarus from the dead, Christ manifests himself as the resurrection and the life. In Mark v. 21—24, 35—43, we find the daughter of Jairus raised to life while she still lies on the death-bed. Luke (vii. 11—17) goes a step further and represents a dead man raised from the coffin. The fourth Evangelist, advancing still further, combines Luke x. 38—42 (whence we have the two sisters, Luke xvi. 27—31 (whence the name Lazarus), and 1 Cor. xv. 35 sqq. (of which a symbolic representation is here given). He thus gives us a new picture altogether: the raising from the dead of one who is already in the grave.

**1.** *Town*: “village.”

**2.** This anointing by Mary is not mentioned as having already taken place, but as a well-known tradition. The account of it appears in xii. 3 sqq.

**3.** *His sisters* should be “the sisters.”

**8.** *Of late sought* should be “have just sought.”

**9.** *The day* is a symbol of the period appointed by God for human action.

**11.** *Sleepeth* should be “has fallen asleep.” [So in ver. 12, *If he sleep* should be “if he has fallen asleep.”]

**12.** *He shall do well*, i.e. “he will recover.”

**13.** *Spake* should be “had spoken.”

**16.** While others warn Jesus of danger (ver. 8, which reminds

us of Matt. xvi. 22), Thomas courageously exhorts them to die with Jesus.

18. *Furlongs*: stadia. Fifteen stadia, about a mile and three quarters.

22. *But I know that even now* should be “but even now I know.” Martha can scarcely mean that she hopes that, in answer to Jesus’ prayer, her brother may be restored to life. It is evident from ver. 24 that she has no such idea. She only declares that, in spite of the irrevocable event which has occurred, she has no doubt as to the miraculous powers which he obtains by prayer. Her feeling is the same as that of Mary (ver. 32).

23. *Shall rise again* should be “will rise again.”

25. *The resurrection and the life*: both are personified in him. He will now manifest himself as the active source of both, and give a proof that he is so in raising Lazarus from the dead. This material resurrection from the dead is of course only a symbol of the spiritual.—*Though he were dead*: “though he die.”

26. For those who believe in him who is life, there is no longer any such thing as death.

27. In answer to Jesus’ question, Martha confesses that she believes in him as Christ, the Son of God. Not having completely grasped the meaning of what Jesus has said (ver. 23), she confesses as much as she has understood, and what she has indeed already believed before.

30. *Town*: “village.”

33. *He groaned in the spirit* should be “he was vexed in the spirit.” This vexation in the spirit signifies a deep, painful excitement, but it is not caused, as is often supposed, by the death of his friend, nor does it arise from overwhelming sympathy. It is an expression of the pain he feels at the blindness of those about him, who, in spite of all his previous manifestations, have not the slightest idea of what he intends to do, and on whom his saying in ver. 25, far from inflaming their hearts, has made no impression whatever.—*And was troubled* should be “and shook himself.” His spirit rises in reaction against the pain he feels; he desires to recover himself and to maintain his self-possession.

35. Tears such as he shed over Jerusalem (Luke xix. 41). The Jews misunderstand them (ver. 36).

**37.** The surly unbelief of one section of the Jews who accompany the mourners, renews his painful excitement and the inner struggle (ver. 38).

**38.** [*Groaning*, the same as in ver. 33.]

**39.** The mention of four days is intended to enhance the miracle in the highest degree. In the mouth of Martha, it indicates her utter hopelessness.

### Verses 45—57

The result of this highest and most tangible manifestation of his living Messianic power is, that the chief-priests and Pharisees resolve to put him to death.

**49.** There seems here to be an erroneous idea that the office of high-priest changed annually. There is no doubt that at that time it changed often enough, not according to any definite order, however, but according to the arbitrary interference of the civil power.

**51.** The delivery of oracles appertained to the high-priest, at least in the early ages. Hence the belief that a prophetic speech was put into his mouth by God, during the exercise of his office, quite apart from any consciousness on his part of the fact that he was prophesying.

**52.** The believers among the Gentiles are called scattered children of God, a name usually applied to the Israelites among the Gentiles. We are here reminded of Eph. ii. 11—22.

**54.** *Ephraim*: a small city of Judea.

### CHAPTER xii.

Verses 1—8 = Mark xiv. 3—9, combined with Luke vii. 37, 38.

Jesus, as the true lamb of God, is dedicated for the Feast of the Passover.

**1.** The day of the Passover being the 15th of Nisan, the sixth day before it (reckoning in Roman fashion) would be the 10th of the month. On this tenth day of the month the paschal lamb had to be selected, one without any defect, Exod. xii. 3—5. This is symbolically represented in the case of Jesus by his anointing.

**6.** *Bare* should be “carried off.”

### Verses 9—11.

A continuation of xi. 45—57. In these verses we find a

description of the new movement which resulted from the events narrated in xi. 1—44.

### Verses 12—36.

Jesus, as the King of Israel foretold by the prophets, receives the homage of his people and of the Gentile world, and also the final divine sanction of the course that ends in his death.

**12—16** = Mark xi. 1—10.

**15.** In the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, the Evangelist sees the fulfilment of a prophetic passage (*Zech. ix. 9*). Jesus thus actually declares himself as the true king of Sion or Israel, but in a spiritual sense, not as king of the Jews.

**20.** To the homage of his own people is now added that of the Greeks, i.e. of Gentiles. These representatives of the Gentile world modestly request that they may be allowed to see Jesus. He rejoices to hear of their wish, and sees in its expression the prelude to the glory which awaits him, and with which are combined such rich fruits for the kingdom of light, including even the Gentiles. Fruits, however, which could only be purchased by his death.

**25, 26.** He adds a warning and a promise to those that believe.

**27—30.** These verses take the place in the fourth Gospel of Mark xiv. 32—42 (*Gethsemane*). So bitter and God-forsaken a struggle with death as we find in Mark, would be unworthy of the incarnate Son of God, especially after the triumphant prayer of ch. xvii.

**27.** *Troubled*: lit. “shaken.”—*For this cause*: i.e. in order that he might receive divine help in the sight of all the world.

**31.** *Now is the judgment* should be “now there is a judgment.” Satan’s rule over this world is broken down.

**32.** This is the Johannine substitute for the return of Christ, which receded more and more into the background the longer it was delayed.

**34.** The people bring forward a Jewish theological objection, possibly one that was actually raised in the time of the Evangelist. Jesus’ reply is, that they must make use of the light during the short period that remains to them, to become the children of light.

**35, 36.** [*While* should be “as,” i.e. according as. *Meyer.*]

**36.** *And did hide himself:* i.e. he vanished, became invisible to them, a symbol of that which was about to happen.

Verses 37—50.

The Evangelist here sums up the results of Jesus' labours and his testimony to the world concerning himself.

**38.** The sad course of events, the want of appreciation on the part of the people, the Evangelist finds foretold by Isaiah (lxxi. 1). He derives consolation, however, from the fact, that in the same prophet (vv. 39—41 = Is. vi. 9, 10) he finds a divine judgment of blindness and hardness of heart is foretold with direct reference to Jesus.

**42.** The sad state of things is to some extent limited.

**44—50.** As we call i. 1—18 the prologue, so we may call this conclusion an epilogue composed in words taken from Jesus himself. The Evangelist here sums up what Jesus is to the world.

**48.** *In the last day:* This ought probably to be omitted. His word exercises its judicial power at once. We find the same interpolation in vi. 39, 40, 44, 54.

CHAPTER xiii.

Jesus' last meal with his disciples. A complete reconstruction of Mark xiv. 22—25.

Verses 1—20.

The symbolic washing of the feet of the disciples. Comp. notes on Luke xii. 37, xxii. 27.

**1.** *Before the feast:* hence this last supper is not the Jewish Passover. See pp. 198 sq.—*He loved them:* This supper is to be a pledge of his love to them, the washing of their feet testifying to it at the same time. The latter represents a two-fold love: first, the love which he who is leaving his disciples bears to them, and secondly, the love which they owe to one another. This mutual love is a reflection of his love for them.

**2.** *And supper being ended* should be “And during a meal that had been prepared.”

**3.** *Went* should be “was going.”

**6.** *Dost thou wash my feet:* with special emphasis on the word “thou.”

**7.** This verse points out that there is a symbolic meaning in

the washing. What this meaning is appears in ver. 8, viz. that Jesus must wash him who is to “have part with him.” But he who already has part with him is made clean altogether (xv. 3), and only a partial cleansing constantly repeated is still required (ver. 10). Jesus thus cleanses his disciples, as the feet, which are perpetually brought into contact with the dust of the earth, require perpetually to be washed anew. Where, then, does Jesus thus wash his disciples? At the Lord’s Supper. The Lord’s Supper is here presented in a new aspect as a purifying love-feast. The love of his disciples for one another must be a purifying love (ver. 14).

**20.** The supper is a seal upon the brotherly covenant which rejects no one who bears the mark which shows that Jesus has sent him (comp. vi. 37). The Evangelist is well acquainted with the Synoptic account of the last supper (comp. the discovery of the traitor). He desires, however, to do away entirely with every connection between the Christian meal and the Jewish Passover. Hence the appointment of the supper as given by the first three Evangelists is here omitted. In its place we find the washing of feet as a symbolic representation of the Christian love-feast. The symbol of the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood has already been elucidated (vi. 53—58), but not in such a way as to limit it to the supper.

### Verses 21—30.

Jesus dismisses the traitor to perform his work of darkness.  
Reconstruction of Mark xiv. 17—21.

**21.** *Troubled*: lit. “stirred” or “violently moved.” The pain which agitates him is caused by the loss of one of his disciples (comp. vi. 70), who thus falls away and assumes a satanic nature, not by the prospect of the death with which he himself is threatened.

**23.** *Leaning on Jesus’ bosom*: lit. “lying in Jesus’ lap” (comp. i. 18). Hence this disciple stands in the same intimate relation to the Son in which the Son stands to the Father. The relation to this disciple, again, is itself typical (comp. xvii. 24).

**24.** Peter appears as less intimate with Jesus, and himself acknowledges this in seeking the mediation of John. The great apostolic name to which Jewish Christianity appealed is all

along thrown into the background behind the ideal disciple of love.

**26.** Who the traitor is, is made known during the meal only to the disciple in Jesus' bosom, and perhaps by him to Peter.

**27.** Jesus himself drives the traitor not only to his decision, but also to the speedy despatch of his deed. The Evangelist wishes to make it perfectly clear that he into whose hands the Father has delivered all things, is neither caught in the toils before he is aware of it, nor falls an unwilling sacrifice to treachery and deceit. He represents Jesus as showing indisputably (ver. 19) how he sees through everything, and gives himself up into the hands of his faithless disciple, because his hour is come when he departs from the world and goes to the Father (ver. 1). This representation is of course entirely unhistorical.

**30.** The night (ix. 4) is come.

#### Verses 31—35.

Transition to Jesus' farewell address to his disciples.

**31.** The hour of glorification is now come, but it is also the hour of separation (33). What he has to say to them may all be comprehended in the fundamental commandment of love.

**32.** *In himself*: comp. xvii. 5.

**34.** *A new commandment*: new inasmuch as such love as he has manifested is new and unheard of.

**35.** This verse is no doubt written from the Evangelist's own experience. The world was astonished at the brotherly love of the Christians. This love he desires to see maintained as the true sign of a Christian.

#### Verses 36—38.

Reconstruction of Mark xiv. 29—31.

**36.** *Thou shalt follow me afterwards*: an indication of Peter's violent death (comp. xxi. 18).

#### CHAPTERS xiv.—xvii.

These four chapters form one section containing the words of comfort and last teachings of Jesus addressed by him to his disciples before he leaves them.

#### CHAPTER xiv

Ere he leaves them, Jesus promises his disciples that he will prepare a heavenly dwelling for them, and that, while they

remain in the world, they shall have, instead of him, a plentiful fulfilment of their prayers and the holy spirit as their helper.

1. *Troubled*: lit. “shaken, moved.”—*Ye believe in God, believe also in me*, should be “believe in God and believe in me.”

2. *Mansions*: “dwellings.”

3. *And if I go and prepare a place for you*, should be “And when I am gone and have prepared a place for you.” His “return” includes not only his own appearance after the resurrection, but also the imparting of the spirit connected therewith (vv. 20—22); for this also was a coming of Jesus, and indeed was more than his first coming. He comes from his Father’s house, i.e. from heaven, the upper world.

6. The conclusion of this verse shows why Jesus calls himself the way. He can lead men to the Father, because he is the bearer of perfect truth. By means of truth he imparts the life which he bears in himself in fullest measure.

7. *From henceforth*: inasmuch as he has told them (ver. 6) who he is.

9. As Philip does not yet understand, he explains that he is what he is only by virtue of the closest spiritual union between himself and the Father.

10. *He doeth the works* should be “doeth the works himself.”

12. *Greater works*: inasmuch as they will correspond to the greater exaltation of Jesus, without whose mediation they are not done. It is not miraculous signs that are here intended, but the results of the gospel itself, which had remained so small, until the corn of wheat (xii. 24) had fallen into the earth.

13, 14. *In my name*: this includes, first, an appeal to his intercession (mediation); secondly, prayer in the closest spiritual communion with him (ver. 20); and thirdly, prayer in accordance with his teaching and in his spirit (ver. 21).

16. *Comforter* should be “helper.” That the “helper” is regarded as a person (though not material), and not simply as a spiritual power, is historically very probable.

18. *Comfortless*: “orphans.” The coming of the spirit is in a higher sense the coming of the glorified Christ himself.

23. He cannot reveal himself to the world, because the world loves him not and is therefore closed against him.

25. *Being yet present with you*: [lit. “remaining with you”] i.e. “because I still tarry with you.”

**26.** *Comforter* should be “helper.”

**27** *Peace*: i.e. a sure and blessed peace of mind.—*Troubled*: strictly, “moved” or “shaken.”

**28.** *Come again* should be simply “come.”—*Ye would rejoice because I said I go unto the Father*, should be “Ye would rejoice that I go unto the Father.” The Father who is greater than Christ will reveal himself still further in him after he is exalted.

**30.** *Hath nothing in me*: i.e. “he has no power over me.” He cannot affect me in any way; and if I allow his violence, I do it only in obedience to the Father’s will.

**31.** “But, that the world may know that I love the Father, and that I do as the Father hath commanded me, arise, let us go hence.”—*Arise*: after Mark xiv. 42. In Mark, however, this word is uttered in Gethsemane; here it is spoken during the meal. According to this, the company rise now from table, but before they really depart, Jesus utters, standing, the contents of ch. xv.—xvii.

#### CHAPTER XV.

Jesus ere his departure testifies to the intimate spiritual communion in which he will still be united with those who remain behind.

##### Verses 1—11.

He will stand in the same relation to them in which the main stem of the vine stands to the fruit-bearing branches.

1. An Old Testament figure. Comp. Ps. lxxx. 8—15; Ezek. xv. 1—6, xix. 10—14.

2. It should be observed that the action of the Father in the care of the redeemed is not supplanted either by the action of the Son after he is exalted, nor by the action of the “helper” who takes his place upon earth. The most important decision is still retained by the Father.

11. *Joy*: the blessed state of mind that is determined by the inalienable spiritual possession.

##### Verses 12—17.

He raises them from the position of servants to that of intimate friends.

15, 16. We have here a picture taken from the court of one of the Cæsars, selecting on his accession, in addition to his ser-

vants, a more intimate circle of friends (*amici*) whom he initiates into his plans. Complete equality is excluded by ver. 16.

15. *I call you not* should be “I no longer call you.”

16. *Ordained*: “appointed.”

### Verses 18—27.

While they share his rejection by the world, they may also share the power of the testimony of the spirit of truth.

18. *Ye know*: “know.” [The Greek may mean either.]

21. *For my name's sake*: because ye acknowledge me.

22. *No cloke*: “no excuse.”

25. *Law*: in the wider sense—the writings of the law; Ps. xxxv. 19.

26. *Comforter* should be “helper.”

27. *And ye also shall bear witness*: to be understood as a commission. Comp. ver. 17.

## CHAPTER xvi.

### Verses 1—15.

The operation of the “helper” (who cannot come until Jesus has gone to his home) in regard to the hostile world and in the inner life of his disciples.

2. It is here evident that at the date of the composition of the Fourth Gospel, the Christian religious community had completely separated from the Jewish, and that the two stood in violent antagonism to each other.—*Time* should be “hour.”

4. *Time* should be “hour.”

5. Comp. xiii. 36, xiv. 5. From the words of Jesus in ver. 7, it appears that it is not simply because they do not ask him *whither* he goes that he is surprised, but because they do not ask of what significance his departure might be to them.

7. *Comforter* should be “helper.”

8. *Reprove* should be “convince.”

9. The sin of the world is pre-eminently unbelief. The spirit will set the fact that this unwillingness to believe is sin so plainly before the world, that it will be convinced.

10. The fact that he is no more seen is manifest proof that he is gone to the Father. The fact that he goes to the Father is a proof of the righteousness of the Son of God who is rejected by the world, and thus is the seal upon his words and his work.

11. That judgment has fallen upon the prince of this world, the devil, and that he has consequently been deprived of his power (xii. 31), will be victoriously proved to the world by the spirit. All this will be forced upon the view of the world (by those who acknowledge him) as a revelation of the spirit, that some may be converted and some become ripe for judgment.

13, 14. This seems to be directed against the Montanist movement in Asia Minor (p. 198). The Montanist theory regarded the spirit as capable of leading men beyond Jesus and his revelation, whereas the Fourth Gospel says the spirit will guide them, not beyond Christ, but only deeper and deeper into his nature.—*Into all truth* should be “into the whole truth.”

### Verses 16—33.

Jesus brings his disciples to the final understanding of his departure to the Father and belief in it.

16. *Because I go to the Father* should be omitted.

17. The interest that is wanting in ver. 5 is here awakened in the minds of the disciples. They ask him what his going away means. Jesus answers that it shall quickly lead them to joy.

25. *Proverbs* should be “parables,” i.e. obscure language which it is not very easy at once entirely to understand. The full meaning will be brought to them by the spirit, being made evident to them indeed by the departure of Jesus to the Father.

29. *Proverb* should be “parable.”—This declaration of the disciples is not to be regarded as a proof of their ignorance or want of real understanding, but Jesus has actually declared plainly (and not for the first time) whence he came and whither he was going, and they have understood it in faith (xvii. 7, 8), but only to become weak in faith immediately afterwards and leave him alone (ver. 32).

### CHAPTER xvii.

This chapter contains the prayer of Jesus which is sometimes called the high-priestly prayer. In this form of a dialogue with the Father he concludes his address to his disciples. Jesus represents himself as ready to enter into his glory after he has completed the divinely-appointed work, and at the same time as one who has preserved those who are his and brought them all to perfection.

## Verses 1—5.

Jesus prays that he may be glorified, i.e. that he may be received into the glory that was prepared for him before the world was.

**2. *Eternal life:*** In the Fourth Gospel this is very far from signifying simply a continuance of life beyond the grave when all things are completed. It is the true spiritual life which is merged in the knowledge of the true God and of him whom He has sent (ver. 3; comp. v. 24). The spiritual fulness of life, which thus enters into men, is indeed of such a nature that no death can in any way affect it. It may rather be said to abolish death, xi. 25, 26.—*As many as* should be “everything that.”

**5.** The question arises whether the glory which Jesus desires to enter is a new and higher glory which has been appointed for him (as in Phil. ii. 9; Heb. ii. 7—9), or a glory which he has already possessed since the world began. The expression, *which I had with thee*, makes the latter supposition the more probable; but indeed the whole theory of the incarnation scarcely leaves any choice in the matter; for one who was God and was in the bosom of the Father can but return to the glory which he has left, and cannot enter into any new or higher glory.

## Verses 6—16.

Jesus prays for those whom the Father has already given to him, that he may preserve them and sanctify them.

**9. *I pray not for the world:*** The world is that part of humanity which has shown itself and will show itself incapable of receiving the divine salvation, in opposition to those whom God has *given* to the Son, and who are *not of the world* (ver. 16), i.e. do not belong to it. It is not intended, however, that this distinction should be understood in the sense of strict predestination. If the Evangelist has a tendency to such a doctrine (xii. 39—41, xiii. 18), still he admits the possibility of belief for all men, and does not relieve them of the responsibility of unbelief (ix. 41, xv. 24).

**11. *Keep through thine own name those whom, &c.,*** should be “Keep them in thy name which thou hast given to me,” &c.

## Verses 12—14.

Jesus now delivers up his own unto the Father, inasmuch as he no longer has them under his own immediate care as before.

Hitherto he has preserved them himself, and himself given to them the Father's word.

17. *Through thy truth* should be "in the truth."

19. *Sanctify*: devote to God, consecrate, i.e. in death. His dedication must work in his disciples so that they also may be dedicated as sharing in the truth. [*Through the truth* should be "in truth."]

#### Verses 20—26.

Jesus prays that all who believe in him may be made perfect in one union with him and the Father, sharing in his glory.

21. So that the (sanctifying) belief in my mission may be extended over the whole earth. This does not mean, however, that every individual man is to attain to belief.

22. The glory which he has given to them is the fulness of grace and truth, by which he manifested himself as the only-begotten of the Father (comp. i. 14, 18).

23. *Made perfect in one* should be "completed into one."

25. *Righteous*: The Father is here called "righteous," or "just," inasmuch as His attitude towards the world, which does not acknowledge the Son on the one hand, and towards those who receive the divine message on the other hand, is but the necessary result of the acceptance or rejection of His love as manifested in Jesus.—*The world hath not known thee*, &c., should be, "As the world hath not known thee (but I have known thee), so these have known," &c.

26. The loving relation of the Father to the Son is to extend to all who belong to the Son, and find its perfect image in the relation of the Son to his own.

#### CHAPTER xviii.

In this and the following chapter we see Jesus himself yielding up his life (comp. x. 18).

#### Verses 1—12.

He surrenders himself to his enemies. The very reverse of Mark xiv. 43—52.

1. The valley of Cedron, between the city and the Mount of Olives.

3. *A band of men*: strictly "the cohort;" this Roman cohort in connection with the capture of Christ only appears in the Fourth Gospel.

4. *All things that should come upon him* should be “all that was coming upon him.”

5. There is no place in the Fourth Gospel for the kiss of Judas. Indeed, the Evangelist appears to omit it purposely, in order to make it more plain that Jesus delivers himself into the hands of his enemies.

6. We must not explain this away by saying that those in front drew back, and perhaps fell in the darkness and confusion. The Evangelist means that those who had been commanded to seize him, overcome by his more than human exaltation, fell to the ground in amazement (comp. vii. 45, 46). They have no power over him. It is rather he who has power over them (xiii. 3); but he delivers himself up into their hands (ver. 8), while at the same time by the power of his word he protects his own from violence (vv. 8, 9).

11. In Matt. xxvi. 52, the reason assigned for abstaining from armed resistance is not quite the same. The point there maintained is, that the employment of violence is a wrong which God avenges.

12. See ver. 3.

#### Verses 13—27.

Peter’s denial, during the trial before the high-priests. A reconstruction of Mark xiv. 53—72.

13. There should be a full-stop at the end of ver. 12, and then ver. 13 should begin, “And they led him,” &c.

15. *Another* should be “the other.” [Most of the old MSS. read “another,” but there are one or two which have “the other.”] “The other disciple” is the same whom the Evangelist has already pointed out (xiii. 24) as most intimate with Jesus, and whom in the account of the last supper he has placed before Peter. Here and in the following chapter this is still more striking. It is not likely that the son of a fisherman of Galilee was a personal friend, or, as might perhaps be meant here, even a relative of the high-priest. It is rendered less improbable, however, by the fact that we have here another form of the Jewish-Christian tradition according to which John (and also his brother James) wore the gold plate on his forehead, which was the sign of high-priestly rank.

16. Peter denies the Lord, although he enjoys the protection

of the friend or even relative of the high-priest. The other disciple, on the contrary, so far from denying his discipleship, acknowledges it in the well-known house by boldly and openly “going in with Jesus” (ver. 15).

**20.** *Whither the Jews always resort*: “where all the Jews come together.”—The words in which Jesus here defends himself are found in the main in the Synoptic Gospels, but are there given in connection with his capture (Mark xiv. 48, 49).

**24.** *Now Annas had sent him*: “And Annas sent him.” This bringing of Jesus before Annas, who is spoken of in ver. 19 as a high-priest, is to be explained by the statement in Luke that Jesus was first taken “into the house of the high-priest,” and then, when it was day, brought before the Sanhedrim (Luke xxii. 54, 56). Annas and Caiaphas are also spoken of there as being high-priests at the same time (Luke iii. 2; Acts iv. 6). Hence it might naturally appear to the fourth Evangelist suitable to represent the high-priest “of that same year” in the great council as preparing for the others. In reality, however, Annas had nothing now of the high-priestly office except the name, and between him and Caiaphas were no less than three high-priests who had been similarly deposed. Nothing is said here about the judicial proceedings and sentence. According to the Fourth Gospel, the Jews had long ago resolved upon the death of Jesus, and so all the stress is now laid upon the proceedings before Pilate.

**26.** [*His kinsman, &c.*: i.e. “kinsman of him whose ear,” &c.]

#### Verses 28—xix. 16.

After long resistance, permission for the execution is at last extorted from Pilate. Reconstruction of Mark xv. 1—20.

**28.** *Lest they should be, &c.*: “that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover.”

**33—37** In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus answers with a simple Yes. In the Fourth Gospel, the imputation of his wishing to be king of the Jews is assigned to the Jews (vv. 34, 35). Jesus declares himself to be a very different king, one whose kingdom is not of this world. He is the royal witness to the truth. Evidently the fourth Evangelist is here anxious to correct the Synoptic description, and rectify it in such a way as to make it harmonize with his representation of Christ.

**38.** We cannot but conclude from the whole bearing of Pilate, as represented in the Fourth Gospel, that his question is to be understood, not as a contemptuous expression of unbelief, but as a powerless inquiry and search for truth on the part of the representative of the heathen world.

**39.** *Will ye therefore that I release unto you?* should be, “If ye will, therefore, I will release unto you.”—Pilate desires to avail himself of the choice of the people between two persons condemned to death for the release of Jesus. The treatment of Jesus described in xix. 1—3 is intended to serve the same purpose. (Comp. note on Luke xxiii. 16.)

#### CHAPTER xix.

**1.** *Scourged him* should be “caused him to be scourged.”

**5.** *Behold the man:* an object rather for pity than for punishment, and certainly no king in the sense of the charge brought against him.

**7.** *A law:* Lev. xxiv. 16, comp. Matt. xxvi. 63 sqq.—*By our law:* “by the law.”

**8, 9.** Pilate appears here as one who is not far from believing in the Son of God.

**11.** *Thou couldest have:* “Thou wouldest have.”—The chief guilt is here said to lie upon the Jews. This is consistent with the whole description of the proceedings before Pilate, which is determined throughout by the writer’s endeavour to oppose to the demands of the Jews the greatest possible resistance on the part of the Roman governor, and thus to bring out to its full extent the guilt of the Jews.

**12.** *From henceforth* should be “in consequence of this.”

**14.** About twelve o’clock. He hangs upon the cross till evening. This is exactly the time when the law directs that the paschal lamb shall be slain. Thus it is also with the true paschal lamb. The proceedings before Pilate occupy, therefore, the whole morning. All this time and labour is required to overcome the resistance on the part of the Gentile who recognizes the innocence and surmises the divine origin of Jesus.

#### Verses 17—30.

Jesus is raised to the cross (comp. iii. 14). Reconstruction of Mark xv. 20—37.

17. He bears his cross himself. In the Synoptics, it is borne for him by Simon of Cyrene.

22. Jesus having rejected the title of King of the Jews, and Pilate by his exhibition of him to the people (vv. 4, 5) having shown that he considers this charge unfounded, the superscription on the cross must be understood as turning the title into a charge against the Jews. They wished him to be condemned as a pretender to a Jewish throne (ver. 15), their real reason, of course, being that they were unwilling to acknowledge him as the Son of God (ver. 7).

23, 24. *Coat* should be “tunic,” an under, not upper, garment. This development of the description of the division of the raiment, which we find in the Fourth Gospel, rests upon an ultra-literal interpretation of Ps. xxii. 18. Comp. a similar case in Matt. xxi. 2, 7

25. We cannot ascertain with certainty from these words, or from any other source, whether the sister of Jesus’ mother is Mary the wife of Cleopas or a person distinct from her.

26. The disciple whom Jesus loves is his spiritual brother, i.e. his true brother (comp. vii. 5). Hence he entrusts to him his mother, perhaps in order thus symbolically to mark him out as the one whom at his departure Jesus himself appoints as guardian of the community which has been gathered together out of Israel.

28. *I thirst*: This is spoken of as a fulfilment of the scripture, inasmuch as the Evangelist finds an allusion to the giving of vinegar to the crucified to drink (ver. 30) in Psalm lxix. 21. No doubt he considers this significant as the prophetic expression of the bitterest sufferings imposed upon him by the wickedness of his brothers (Ps. lxix. 8). Thus the words *I thirst* are suitably placed as his last saying before the words “It is finished” (ver. 30), which of course are to be understood of the completion of the divine counsel.

29. A rod of hyssop would not be suitable for such a purpose. On the other hand, it is appropriate to the paschal lamb (Ex. xii. 22).

30. He has drunk the bitter cup (xviii. 11).—*Gave up the ghost* should be “yielded up his spirit.” The expression is undoubtedly chosen with reference to Luke xxiii. 46.

**Verses 31—42.**

Three divine signs on the corpse of Jesus, viz. that his legs are not broken, that blood and water flow from his side when it is pierced, and that he is buried as a rich man. Transformation and reconstruction of Mark xv. 38—47.

**31.** The Jews are desirous of knowing that the legs of Jesus have been broken, in order to preserve their paschal feast from being defiled. But the bones of the paschal lamb must not be broken (Exod. xii. 46). Hence Jesus is indicated by God himself as the true paschal lamb by the fact that his legs are not broken. In place of this, therefore, Jesus is pierced in the side after he is dead, and this proves a fulfilment of a passage of scripture (ver. 37, comp. Zech. xii. 10).

**34.** The Evangelist certainly does not mean that the death of Jesus is proved by the flowing of blood and water from his side. This is rather symbolical of the way in which the fountain of the true means of purification is opened to mankind in the death of Jesus. The two substances refer without doubt to the mysteries of the Christian religion, the blood to the Lord's Supper, and the water to baptism.

**35.** There is some reason for believing that the fourth Evangelist found previous traditions both of the legs of Jesus not having been broken, and of his having been pierced by a lance, and that he did not invent either statement—though both traditions have the appearance of being very recent. On the other hand, the flowing forth of blood and water, with its deep symbolic meaning, may very probably have been the Evangelist's own idea, and it is just for this spiritual perception of the flowing of the fountains of life from Jesus' corpse that he adduces Jesus' most intimate disciple as his authority. It should be noticed that the Evangelist by no means appeals to this disciple for all his statements, but only for this single trait, the appreciation of which assumes a spiritual insight.

**39.** The rulers and greatest men of the hostile Jewish people must rescue the honour of Jesus now that all is perfected, must show him such reverence as shall manifest his righteousness (xvi. 10), and condemn their own nation immediately upon the completion of the crime. We can get no other meaning from this participation of the "ruler of the Jews" (iii. 1). Even by

the standard of the law, Jesus is righteous (comp. vii. 51), and an honourable Jewish burial, such as is his right, must be given him by Jews. I probably the Evangelist also read Is. liii. 9, “They shall give him a tomb with the rich because he hath committed no crime, and no deceit was in his mouth,” and then understood the passage to refer to the Son of God who had returned home to the Father.

## CHAPTER XX.

### Verses 1—29.

Jesus manifests himself after his death as the living Lord and God. Reconstruction of Luke xxiv. 1, 2, 9—12. Comp. note on 1 Cor. xv. 4—8.

### Verses 1—10.

The empty grave leads the two disciples, who stand pre-eminent above the others, to the belief that he still lives.

**2.** These two appear in the Fourth Gospel as the leaders of the company of disciples, and John as the first of the two. In the Synoptics, on the other hand, James appears with John, and Peter stands first.

**4.** The yearning of the closest and deepest love urges the disciple “whom Jesus loved” more quickly to the grave than Peter. He outstrips him.

**5.** After he has seen the clothes lying empty he remains astonished and lost in thought before the grave.

**6.** Peter, when he comes up, perceives the napkin laid on one side, carefully rolled up, the sign that the dead still lives.

**8.** Now the other disciple follows, and the sight induces him “to believe” (i.e. to believe that Jesus lives). He is therefore the first of the disciples to believe. It is not expressly said of Peter that he believed; no doubt the fourth Evangelist wishes to make him follow John in this “belief,” without expressly saying so. This is accounted for by the account in Luke (xxiv. 12), on which the present narrative is based. There Peter (alone), after looking into the grave, goes home “wondering” (i.e. not having attained to belief). [In Luke xxiv. 12, some translators render “departed to his home wondering,” instead of “departed wondering in himself.”]—These two disciples here require no appearance of the Lord; the empty grave brings them

to belief, though in such a way that as yet they know not the scripture (ver. 9), which appears from ii. 22, xii. 16, to be an essential part of a complete belief.

Verses 11—18.

Jesus sends word to his brethren of his ascent to the Father. Reconstruction of Luke xxiv. 3—8.

11. This happens immediately, early on the first day of the week, Sunday. Mary must be supposed to have returned to the grave without delay. She sees angels, which she appears not to recognize as such; she is spoken to by Jesus himself, whom in her grief she similarly fails to recognize. But when he speaks, when she hears the loving voice of the true shepherd (x. 4, 14), she recognizes him at once.

17. In her joy at seeing him again, she seeks to embrace his knees. He refuses to allow this; for he is on the way to the Father, and this ascent to his God and Father, and the God and Father of his brethren, is the last step in the completion of his revelation, and is as necessary to his disciples (xvi. 7) as to himself. Until this has taken place he cannot be for them the glorified one. This, then, is no time to touch him; it is the time to announce to those who are his that the great moment of his return to his home has arrived. Hence the fourth Evangelist represents Jesus as ascending to God at once, on the very day on which the grave is found empty—an invisible ascension, by the side of which a later and visible ascension has no place. Mary's desire to touch him is accordingly only a subordinate trait in the account, and it is not the intention of the Evangelist to represent Mary as weak in faith.

Verses 19—23.

Jesus after his return to the Father fulfils his promise and breathes his spirit into those whom he sends forth. Reconstruction of Luke xxiv. 33—40; Acts ii. 1—4.

20. There is no indication that the disciples were unwilling to believe him without his showing his hands and his side. He shows them voluntarily, in order that no doubt may arise as to its being he. We must not conclude from this that the fourth Evangelist conceives of the body of the departed Jesus as material, but Jesus gives signs which cannot deceive. According to our Evangelist, the flesh profiteth nothing (vi. 63). He is as

far, therefore, as Paul from regarding the body of Jesus, as he now appears, as a fleshly body. For him the resurrection by no means consists in a restoration of the body to life, but in the continuance of life, and the manifestation of himself as still living in spite of death.—It is remarkable that the pierced feet are not mentioned here, as they are in the Synoptic Gospels.

**21.** *Peace be unto you:* They shall now receive it, as he had promised (comp. xiv. 27). He gives them his peace as he himself has obtained it. He also commissions them to be his witnesses (xv. 27); and they further receive the spirit, the “helper” (xv. 26, vii. 39).—*Receive ye the Holy Ghost* should be “Receive holy spirit.”

**23.** Reconstruction of Matt. xviii. 18.

#### Verses 24—29.

The heavenly Christ gives material proof to weak faith, and brings the disciple, who is so hard to convince, to the acknowledgment of his divinity.

**28.** This confession embraces everything that the Fourth Gospel is intended to set forth in all its representations of Christ. Comp. p. 195.

**29.** As the miracles are only symbolical representations of the spiritual life, and yet are conceived of as historical, so the appearances of the risen one which are physically perceived are indications of his true heavenly existence. They are concessions to the weakness of the physical nature of man, which the believer does best not to use, and must at any rate learn to do without.

**30, 31.** Conclusion of the Gospel. It should be noticed that the whole representation of the life of Jesus is given as it is seen from what we may call the miraculous point of view. In the miracles he reveals his divine nature and power. His word is for the most part only the explanation of his symbolical acts.

**31.** *Through his name:* “in his name.”

#### CHAPTER xxi.

#### Verses 1—23.

A supplement to the Fourth Gospel, from another hand, written in the interests of Peter. The intention of this passage, viz. to bring Peter, the prince of the apostles, forward from his position after the beloved disciple, is self-evident. This is itself proof

sufficient that the chapter does not belong to the Gospel, and that it cannot be from the hand of the Evangelist.

#### Verses 1—8.

The plentiful draught of fishes under the leadership of Peter. Reconstruction of Luke v. 1—11.

3. *Into a ship*: “into the ship.”

5. *Have ye any meat?* should be, “Have ye anything to eat with your bread?” [The word rendered “meat” signifies, strictly, something eaten with other food, especially meat or fish eaten with the bread or vegetables that formed the chief part of the meal.] Here fish is meant, which was very commonly eaten with bread. Jesus puts his question as if he desired something to eat.

6. Peter appears here as the apostle who is called to cast his net out into the great Gentile world, and meets with the richest results. So also in Luke v. 6, where we have likewise a symbolic narrative.

7. Here also we have a contest between the two which shall bear away the palm. While the intimate and pensive disciple recognizes the Lord, Peter, active and vigorous, casts himself into the sea, unable to wait in his eagerness to come to Jesus. He is here compensated for the representation of his being left behind in the race to the grave (xx. 4).

#### Verses 9—14.

The Lord has a plentiful meal ready for his fishermen to refresh them after their work is finished. Reconstruction of Luke xxiv. 41—43.

11. The most important part of the work, the actual drawing out of the net upon the land, is performed by Peter (comp. ver. 8). The full name, Simon Peter, in all its solemnity, is no doubt used intentionally (vv. 2, 3, 7, 11, 15). It is due to the skill of his hand that the net, in spite of the multitude of fishes, is not broken (comp. note on Luke v. 6); and so his name represents the unity of the church. The great fishes are probably intended to represent the congregations, so that Peter is represented as properly the founder and leader of the congregations and the supporter of the unity of the Church.

14. We must not conclude from this number that the Evangelist himself added this supplementary passage, for in chapter

xx. we have, as we have already pointed out, a graduated set of three manifestations of the glorified Jesus.

Verses 15—23.

To Simon Peter the supervision of the flock is assigned by him who is strictly the shepherd. The other disciple is only specially directed to "tarry."

**15.** The question here should probably be taken as a humiliation of Peter for his denial of Christ; the answer, as a sufficient propitiation. The first place among the apostles in the conduct of the flock is plainly given to him, a tradition which we find as early as the Synoptics. (Comp. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.)

**18.** The promise that he shall be glorified by a violent death is further given to him. By it he is to be made a perfect follower of Jesus (ver. 19). Perhaps the stretching forth of the hands indicates a death by crucifixion. The stress laid upon the martyr's death, and indeed the whole exaltation of Peter, suggest Rome as the place where this appendix to the Gospel was written. Perhaps it was intended to make the Fourth Gospel, with its Asiatic preference for John, more acceptable to the Romans.

**23.** At the time when this appendix was composed, John appeared in tradition as the apostle who was to survive all the others. It had been expected that, in fulfilment of Mark ix. 1, he would not die, but live to see the second coming of the Lord. Yet he had died and the Lord had not come. How could this be explained? The writer of the appendix explains it thus: Jesus never said that John should not die, but only that he should tarry, i.e. remain longer than Peter and the other apostles. A misunderstanding of his words gave rise to a belief which experience proved to be false; for Jesus had only said that it was nothing to Peter if he would that this disciple should tarry till he came. Thus the disciple whom Jesus loved retains a position of importance by the side of Peter, but at the same time the latter is distinctly placed before him by the commission to feed the flock of Jesus.

Verses 24, 25.

Conclusion of the appendix. The writer not only refers directly to the beloved disciple as the authority for this appendix (which the fourth Evangelist only does in the case of a single mysterious occurrence), but he even declares that the appendix

(and probably he includes with it the whole Gospel) was actually written by that disciple. There is no reason whatever for supposing that these verses are from the hand of a third party who wished to bear testimony to the authenticity of the Gospel. This supposition is excluded by verse 23, which could not be the conclusion, and verse 25, with which only a writer, and not a witness to the book, could conclude. To bear witness concerning the events of the life of Jesus, as no other can, appears to the writer of the appendix to be the special office of this apostle who survives the others. In this he agrees with the writer of the Gospel.

## THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

---

THE Book of Acts, according to ecclesiastical tradition and its own assertion (i. 1), is the work of the author of the third Gospel. This view is also supported by the style of the writer and the view which he takes of his subject. The gospel narrative, the first part of which is contained in the third Gospel, is continued from the account of the resurrection of Jesus (A.D. 35) to Paul's entrance into Rome and his two years' residence there, i.e. down to the year A.D. 64. For this reason, the collectors of the New Testament writings placed it between the Gospels and Paul's Epistles, for which it affords an historical setting, and gave it the name of "The Acts of the Apostles."

The writer begins by indicating generally, in the parting words of Jesus to his disciples (i. 8), the subject of his work, which is a description of the spread of the gospel from Jerusalem and Judea through Samaria to the ends of the earth. In accordance with this, the first part of the Book of Acts (i. 1—ix. 30) gives an account of the establishment of the Christian Church in Palestine; and the second part, which is considerably more comprehensive (ix. 31—xxviii. 31), gives an account of its extension in the heathen world, first its spread in Asia, then its passage to Europe, and finally the way by which the gospel reached the imperial city of Rome. The description of the founding of the Church, which is contained in the first part, is essentially connected with the person of the Apostle Peter, while the spread of the gospel among the Gentiles is almost throughout connected with the Apostle Paul. At the same time, the account of the

conversion of Paul is found in the first part, and the second part opens with the consecration of the mission to the Gentiles by Peter.

The writer, however, by no means limits himself to an historical account of the progress of the gospel during the period which we have indicated. He pursues in his history a purpose which is easily recognized. He supplies us with historical information only so far as it serves this purpose, and he gives it in a form which is adapted to it. For the same reason he brings his narrative to a close at the period when events ceased to correspond with the object of his work. The object itself is neither historical nor scientific, but religious; nor, again, is it religious edification in general, but the satisfaction of a very definite want of the Church which existed at the time when the book was produced.

### 1. THE PURPOSE OF THE Book.

We may plainly perceive the purpose of the writer, in the first place, by observing the different relation to the gospel in which he places Judaism and Heathenism. He describes the transition of Christianity from the Jews to the Gentiles, but not as though both shared alike in its advantages. He represents the Jews, for whom it was first designed, as rejecting it, though it is offered to them again and again, as persecuting it and thus compelling the apostles to seek another field for their mission; while the Gentiles, to whom the gospel now turns, come forward eagerly asking that they may receive the joyful message, welcome it almost everywhere with delight, and even protect the apostles from Jewish persecution. The persecutions which the apostles have to suffer are almost always represented in the Book of Acts as originating with the Jews. This is the case not only in Jerusalem, iv. 1 sqq., v. 17 sqq., vi. 8 sqq., vii. 54 sqq., xii. 1, 3 sqq., but also in the Gentile world in the field of Paul's mission, in Pisidia, xiii. 50 sqq., in Iconium, xiv. 2, 4, in Lystra, xiv. 19 sqq.,

in Thessalonica, xvii. 5 sqq., in Berea, xvii. 13 sqq. Only a persecution in Philippi and a riot against the apostles in Ephesus originate with the Gentiles, and even then in the former city the wrong which has been committed is confessed and expiated, xvi. 27 sqq., 35 sqq., and in the latter a Gentile formally declares the Christians free from all guilt, xix. 37 sqq. On the other hand, the greater part of the Book of Acts is devoted to magnificent results of the apostolic preaching among the Gentiles. In Athens alone does Paul find an unfruitful soil, and yet even there he finds a little congregation and makes some important acquisitions to Christianity, xvii. 34. And where the Gentile authorities have to do with the apostles, they protect them in their rights against the slanderous accusations of the Jews, and expressly acknowledge their innocence of every kind of crime or civil offence. This is the case with the Roman officials in Philippi, xvi. 35 sqq., in Corinth, xviii. 12 sqq., in Ephesus, xix. 37 sqq., and in Jerusalem, xxiii. 28 sqq., xxv. 25, xxvi. 31 sqq. The first fruits of the preaching of the gospel by Peter and Paul are Roman officers, x. 1 sqq., xiii. 7 sqq. When Paul is in danger of being killed by the Jews, he is delivered by the Romans, xxi. 31 sqq., xxiii. 10; and even when he is a prisoner, the Roman laws leave him at liberty to preach the gospel down to the time when our history of the Acts of the Apostles terminates, xxviii. 30 sq., comp. xxiv. 23. Even the very worst errors of heathenism are an advantage to the gospel, and in Lystra the apostles are joyfully received as gods who have come down from heaven, xiv. 8 sqq., comp. xxviii. 6. Moreover, the prejudices of the Gentiles against the gospel are carefully borne in mind, all confusion between the gospel and the hateful Jewish law being specially provided against, xv. 19 sqq., 28 sq., xvi. 4, political prejudices of Rome against Christianity are resisted, xvii. 7—9, xviii. 14—17, xix. 38, xxiii. 29, xxv. 18 sqq., and the manifold preparations for Christianity through heathenism are pointed out, xiv. 16 sqq., xvii. 22 sq., 27 sqq., from all which it is plain that it must also have been the writer's intention to defend the gospel

against heathenism and the Roman State, in the sight of *heathen* readers, and to recommend it to them.

Nevertheless, the Book of Acts is intended in the first instance for *Christian* readers, and above all it is designed to supply a want of the *Church*. With a view to this also the anomalous position which Jew and Gentile take up in regard to the gospel is of the highest importance. From the time of the Apostle Paul's independent appearance, the central question around which all the movements of Christianity gather is, whether the gospel was intended exclusively or pre-eminently for the Jews, or whether it was originally and equally intended for all nations of the earth; in other words, whether salvation in Christianity still depends upon the observance of the Mosaic law, or only upon faith and self-surrender to the divine grace and righteousness which was offered in the sacrificial death of Jesus. The settlement of the dispute between the Jewish, national and legal gospel of the primitive Christian community in Jerusalem and Paul's gospel, which was designed for all the world and was free from the law, is the main subject not only of the Pauline Epistles but also of all other documents of the apostolic or post-apostolic times; and hence it will be important to us to know what position the writer of the Book of Acts takes up in regard to this great question. He stands, as appears at once from his general statement of the contents of the book, essentially upon the Gentile-Christian side. It is declared, i. 8, that the gospel was originally and equally intended for all nations of the earth; and when it is rejected by Israel, it finds among the Gentiles a favourable soil and produces the richest fruits. But this destination of the gospel for the whole world must not appear as a matter of strife among the apostles themselves, otherwise it would again be brought into question by the Book of Acts itself. It must appear as the basis of the preaching of the gospel which Jesus himself desired and which the apostles unanimously recognized, in order that its full historical claims may thus be established. The strife and controversy of the apostolic times concerning it must be

silenced or concealed. Now Peter was well known as the chief representative, among the apostles, of the Jewish-Christian gospel, while Paul was the original and independent representative of the gospel for the whole world emancipated from the law. The name and figure of the former represented the Jewish-Christian, and of the latter the Gentile-Christian gospel, in the post-apostolic, even as they had already done in the apostolic age. But the writer of the Book of Acts must not take up his position on either side if he is to succeed in his purpose of setting before his readers the original and harmonious recognition of the abolition of all national limitations in the gospel. Instead of this, he must represent Peter and Paul as equals, working together in complete agreement as the representatives of the one gospel among Jews and Gentiles.

Consistently with this, the first part of the book deals mainly with the former apostle, and the second part almost exclusively with the latter. The two are esteemed as of equal rank, to both are the same privileges and the same honour accorded, and Peter is made to appear as Pauline, Paul as Petrine, as possible. Peter pronounces the Gentile-Christian declaration of redemption, ii. 39, iii. 26, takes the first step in the conversion of the Gentiles, x., and himself puts aside the Jewish-Christian prejudices against it, ix. 1—18, xv. 7—12. On the other hand, Paul accepts a portion of the Jewish law for his Gentile-Christian communities, and pleads for it among the Gentiles, xv. 29—31, xvi. 4, xxi. 25. Moreover, it is assumed in the Book of Acts that it is the duty of those who were formerly Jews to continue to observe the Mosaic law, xv. 23 sqq., xxi. 21 sqq., and accordingly Paul here keeps strictly to it. He himself circumcises the son of a Greek because his mother was a Jewess, xvi. 1 sqq. He considers himself bound to observe the Jewish festivals and to keep the Passover in Jerusalem, xviii. 21, xxiv. 11. He takes upon himself the vow of a Nazirite and bears the expense of a similar vow for others, xviii. 18, xxi. 26. He represents himself to the Jews as a believer in the Scriptures, in the old sense of the

phrase, xxiv. 14—17, and as a Pharisee, xxiii. 6. And though so often rejected by them, still to the very last he turns in his preaching always in the first place to the Jews, xvii. 2, xxviii. 17 sqq.

Hence, while the author of the Book of Acts desires to demonstrate by his history of the apostolic age that the gospel was originally intended equally for the whole world, thereby declaring himself as a representative of the Pauline gospel, and is so far from any adhesion to a strict and privileged Jewish nationality that he actually regards the Jews as the fiercest enemies of Christianity; at the same time he is very far from taking up the position which was actually taken by the Apostle Paul. He has no desire to impress upon his contemporaries the validity of the Mosaic law for the Jews, or of the extracts mentioned in xv. 20 for the Gentile Christians; at the same time he endeavours by means of the picture of a Christianity of the apostolic age which is half under the law, to justify a Christianity which has become again partly under the law. With this purpose he turns away from the contradictions of the apostolic doctrine, and puts into the mouth of all the representatives of the gospel in the apostolic age, the doctrine of *his own age*. He writes neither for Pauline nor for Jewish Christians, for this distinction has retired behind a new conception of the gospel which has adopted from Paul the abolition of all national limitations, and from Jewish Christianity all the rest of its didactic substance. He is acquainted with the Epistles of Paul and the principles of his gospel, the doctrine of Justification not by the law (xiii. 39), but by faith (xv. 11). But he does not bring out this gospel clearly and logically, and he establishes the universal destiny of Christianity for the whole world in a manner quite different from that of Paul. Paul's gospel, so exalted and yet founded upon the deepest wants of the heart and the necessity of his own thought, here appears materialized and reduced to a few meagre and general propositions. The fact is, that the Pauline argument for Christianity free from the law, which rests entirely upon the free grace of God, and can only find satisfaction in unconditional

self-surrender to it, made too great demands upon the intellect and the will of man, to be able long to remain valid, without admixture of the law. There is in the natural man an ineradicable tendency to a ceremonial service of God, and to reliance in respect of the whole of life upon the law; and a great ecclesiastical community appears indeed absolutely to require a certain ceremonial regulation of the life and belief of its members in order that it may hold together both externally and internally. Hence the striking divergence between the doctrine of the Pauline Epistles and that of the author of the Acts of the Apostles. In the Epistles, Paul rests his right to abolish every distinction between Jews and Gentiles solely upon the decisive significance which he assigns to the death of Jesus on the cross. This death alone has wrought full satisfaction for our sins, which was impossible without it. It has given to us righteousness, and thereby has overthrown all reliance upon our observance of the law, and thus has abolished every privilege of the Judaism which is of the law, and removed every barrier between Jew and Gentile. On the other hand, the Paul of Acts supports his right to preach to the Gentiles, not upon a practical spiritual necessity, but always upon the miraculous appearance on the way to Damascus, upon the express command of God confirmed by a miracle (xxii. 5 sqq. 18, 21, xxvi. 12 sqq. 19). The death of Christ indeed is regarded in the Book of Acts, as in every form of the gospel, as the condition of forgiveness of sins (xx. 28), but nowhere in the book is the conclusion drawn that the death upon the cross was a power sufficient in itself for this, and that therefore the endeavour after righteousness through the works of the law is useless, vain and even pernicious, although the speeches of Paul would have afforded the most abundant opportunity for the exposition of this principle of his gospel. In the Epistles, Paul, knowing no righteousness save that which is of grace, demands only the appropriation of it by complete surrender to it, i.e. by faith. The Paul of the Book of Acts, on the other hand, demands faith no doubt (xiii. 39, xvii. 31, xx. 21, xxvi. 27),

but here we do not find this faith, either in the mouth of Paul or anywhere else, made to rest upon the fact of the crucifixion, and it is never regarded as the exclusive condition of salvation, and opposed to the fulfilment of the law, not even in xiii. 39 (comp. the explanation given in the note on this passage). On the contrary, the word faith is used here only in the general sense of the acceptance of the new teaching, the essence of which is the doctrine of the Messiahship of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins (x. 42, xvii. 31, xx. 21, 43). It is submission to the fact that Jesus is proved to be the Messiah (vi. 7). Hence we find in the Book of Acts a more or less vague conception of penance or conversion required as a condition of salvation (ii. 38, iii. 19, v. 31, viii. 22, x. 43, xi. 18, xiii. 38, xvii. 30, xx. 21, xxii. 16, xxvi. 18, 20). The position which the Paul of the Book of Acts maintains is assumed throughout the book, namely, that the gospel both of Peter and of Paul agrees as to its doctrine with orthodox Judaism (xxiii. 6, xxiv. 14, xxvi. 22, xxviii. 23), only with this difference, that the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is maintained in relation to Jesus, he is acknowledged as the Messiah, and every national privilege of the Jews is annulled. There are scarcely any traces whatever of any deeper comprehension of the peculiar religious significance of the person of Jesus, such as we find in Paul (see note on iii. 15).

Hence it follows that whoever tries to interpret the Book of Acts by the apostolic times, and to find in it an exact picture of them, must of necessity place himself point by point in direct opposition to the genuine documents of those times, especially the Epistles of Paul, or else he must harmonize them with the representation of the Book of Acts in a superficial manner and by means of unsupported assumptions. And ultimately he cannot but do injustice after all either to the author of the Book of Acts or to Paul. The book can only be rightly understood when we recognize in it the attempt *to justify to the Church itself a later stage of the development of Christianity by means of a special representation of the period of its own foundation*, a representation cor-

responding to an ecclesiastical Christianity which had advanced in its conquest of the world, but had degenerated in itself, and consequently essentially different from any true picture of apostolic Christianity. But this attempt on the part of the author can only be blamed by those who are unaware that such free treatment of historical material was quite usual among the ancients, and was indulged in without the slightest sense of dishonesty. It was, moreover, especially common in the New Testament times, and in regard to all matters not purely scientific.

## 2. CREDIBILITY.

While, however, the author himself places the historical interest of the book far behind its religious interest, we, who are mainly dependent upon it for our knowledge of the apostolic age, cannot but regard the question of its historic credibility as of the greatest importance. The inquiry itself cannot be separated from the further questions, whether the writer availed himself of older written sources of information, and if so, of what kind these sources were. It is quite clear that the first of these questions must be answered in the affirmative; for it is not to be supposed that one who certainly stood at some distance from the apostolic age could have composed such a work either from his own or other men's recollection of oral tradition, still less that he should simply have invented it all. The nature of his sources, however, we can for the most part no longer ascertain. The only one that we can clearly distinguish is an account of the journeys of the Apostle Paul, which may be recognized in four places in the second half of the book by the sudden change from the use of the third person to that of the first person plural "we" (xvi. 10—17, xx. 4—15, xxi. 1—18, xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16). That this account does not originate with the writer himself is indisputable. For no narrator changes without warning from the third to the first person, and vice versa. And again, it is clear that the use of the first or third person does not correspond with the

presence or absence of the narrator. And, finally, it would be impossible to understand why the writer, if he accompanied the Apostle Paul, should have described so exactly, even to the smallest details, unimportant matters, such as the voyages, and on the other hand despatched long and important periods with a very general, cursory and lifeless description (comp. xviii. 22, 23, xx. 1—3, xxiv. 27, xxviii. 30, with the detailed accounts of voyages in xvi. 10—17, xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16, and the picture of the trial of Paul in six chapters, xxi.—xxvi.). The author, however, of those parts which are distinguished by the occurrence of the word “we,” may be recognized by the detail and exactness of his statements with regard to time and place, and by the vividness of his narrative, as an eye-witness, i.e. as a fellow-traveller and companion of Paul; and we have no reasonable ground for doubting that he is the Luke of ecclesiastical tradition (comp. Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Col. iv. 14). And this probability approaches as near to certainty as anything in connection with this question can do, when we consider that the superscription, “according to Luke,” prefixed to the first part of the work, could never have been placed there by the collectors and arrangers of the books of the New Testament, unless they had had some distinct tradition as to the share of this companion of Paul in the work of proclaiming the gospel among the nations. It was probably of deliberate purpose that, in his narrative of the three most important episodes in the spread of the gospel by Paul, the passage into Europe, xvi. 10—17, the conclusion of the three missionary journeys, xx. 5—xxi. 8, and the journey to Rome, xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16, the writer presented the account in its original journalistic style, in order that here the authenticity of his description might be apparent. As a rule, however, he has only quoted this account which he had before him where it agreed with the purpose of his own work, or at least did not interfere with it. Long periods, upon which this source of information cannot have been silent, are entirely passed over, e.g. the whole of the third journey, of which only the halt at Ephesus is de-

scribed in detail, xviii. 23—xx. 4. Further, he has inserted into what he has taken from this source passages intended to support the general aim of the book, some of which are still easily recognizable, e.g. the address to the elders of the community at Miletus, xx. 17—38; the detailed account of the capture and trial of Paul, xxi. 19—xxvi. 32; such passages as xxvii. 21—26, 33—36; and the conclusion of the whole work, xxviii. 17—31. What the writer of the Book of Acts has retained consists for the most part of very careful statements as to the routes and the dates of Paul's journeys. And all these we may regard as unconditionally trustworthy.

As for the rest of the book, it may very well be supposed that the detailed narratives concerning the Apostle Peter, and some other sections also, were based upon information drawn from special written sources, the nature of which indeed can no longer be determined. So far, however, as we can test and judge the Book of Acts by comparing it with other sources of information on the same subjects, and particularly with the Pauline Epistles, we find that it is strongly coloured and indeed altered by the purpose of the book itself, especially in all that relates to the contests between Paul and the Twelve. Still we may probably take its historical statements as being on the whole really historical, and having a basis of fact and genuine tradition, although it must be confessed that in many of the accounts we can now no longer separate the portions derived from sources already to some extent legendary, and the writer's own alterations, from the original basis of the narrative. The connected *discourses*, however, which appear in the Book of Acts bear so distinctly the mark of the peculiar views of the writer, that they must be regarded almost entirely as his own free composition (see notes on i. 18, ii. 39, iii. 26, v. 34 sqq. 40, vii. 1, x. 34 sqq., xiii. 15 sqq., &c.). Notwithstanding this, the book is still of great value, apart from the importance of its contributions to our knowledge of the religious life of the period of its composition, as the unique, continuous source for the history of the apostolic times,

provided only that it is used with care. For details we must refer our readers to the commentary below.

## DATE.

The date of the composition of the Book of Acts can only be approximately determined. That the position of the writer is alien to the apostolic age is clear, and though he breaks off his narrative in the year of Paul's death, without mentioning the death itself, which took place in the Neronian persecution of the year 64, the reason of this is not, as might be supposed, that the book was written before that event. The writer would to a great extent have counteracted the whole purpose of his work if he had concluded with an account of a fearful persecution of the Christians by the Gentiles, to which the apostle of the Gentiles fell a sacrifice. According to the genuine Epistles written during his imprisonment, Paul did not expect to be put to death (Phil. ii. 24, Philem. 22). In the Book of Acts, however, he is represented as distinctly foretelling his death before he is taken prisoner in Jerusalem, i.e. at least four years before 64 (xx. 25, xxi. 13), and hence it is evident that the writer has put into the mouth of Paul in the form of prophecy what had long been known to him as an accomplished fact. A somewhat firmer ground for fixing the date of the book is afforded perhaps by the following circumstance: In four passages it is stated that Gentile officials distinctly declared the Christians as such to be liable to no civil penalty simply on the ground of their religious position or name, and that a charge against them could only be heard on the ground of some definite and demonstrable offence against the law. This is the decision given by Gallio, proconsul of Achaia, when the Jews accuse Paul before him (xviii. 14 sqq.), by the town clerk of Ephesus, on occasion of the disturbance caused by Demetrius (xix. 37 sq.), by the Roman chiliarch Claudius Lysias (xxiii. 29), and by Porcius Festus, governor of Judea, at the trial of Paul (xxv. 18). Now it is quite certain

that this separation of the civil from the religious aspect of Christianity was not made by the Romans in the apostolic times, but was first made altogether temporarily by the emperor Trajan in regard to the trials of the Christians in Bithynia in the year 112. This distinction, however, is all the more vehemently insisted upon by the Christian apologists of the second century whose writings have come down to us, and hence the Book of Acts may be placed, not indeed with absolute certainty but with great probability, at the beginning of this series of apologetic writings, i.e. about 100—120 A.D. Moreover, the difference between the accounts in Luke xxiv. and Acts i. as to the relations between the resurrection and the ascension in point of time (comp. Acts i.3), also indicates pretty clearly that a considerable period elapsed between the composition of the third Gospel and that of the Book of Acts, during which the writer had been led by new sources of information and different traditions to take another view of the matter.

#### PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

Rome may be regarded with great probability as the place where the Book of Acts was composed. This supposition is supported by the oldest ecclesiastical tradition, and further by the circumstance that the writer assumes that his readers are acquainted with the geography of Italy, while on the other hand he enters, here and there at least, into explanations with regard to other countries (compare, for example, xxviii. 12, 13, 15, with xiii. 14, xiv. 6, xvi. 12). But, above all, the purpose of the book itself may be best understood on the supposition that the writer had in his mind, in the first instance, the citizens and officials of the imperial city and the Christian community there as his readers. The book represents the victorious progress of the gospel as culminating in the journey of Paul to Rome and his residence there. In the last seven chapters, other countries and other communities are not even mentioned. Paul's journey to

Rome is alluded to eight chapters before its occurrence (xix. 21), and from that time forward almost the whole of the narrative is written with direct reference to this journey. Its occasion and significance are then set before the reader with the fullest detail in the account of the trial of Paul at Jerusalem and Cæsarea (xxi.—xxvi.), and the journey itself is then described with incomparably greater detail than any other of the missionary journeys, even down to the most unimportant incidents (xxvii., xxviii. 1—16). Further, the stress which is laid in the Book of Acts upon Paul's Roman citizenship (xvi. 37, xxii. 25), and the prominence given to the just and kind treatment which he meets with at the hands of the Roman officials, point to Rome as the place of its composition. And still more decisively does the conclusion of the whole book favour this supposition (xxviii. 25—28). For the apostle here finally meets with the very same experience in Rome which he is described as meeting with throughout the whole Book of Acts, the hostile rejection of the gospel on the part of the Jews, its joyful acceptance by the Gentiles. Thus the final incident points out the imperial city as the destination of the book, and hence probably as the place where it was composed.

The fact that the superscription of the first work of our author contains the name of Luke, is sufficiently explained by the ancient and credible tradition that the sections in the second part of the book in which the narrator uses the first person, "we," are from the hand of this companion of the Apostle Paul.

## THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

i.—ix. 30.

The first great division of the book. The founding of the church in Palestine.

### CHAPTER i.

Christ's last commands and the restoration of the full number of the apostles.

1. *The former treatise* is the Gospel according to Luke, which is by the same writer as the Book of Acts, and is dedicated to the same person, a Gentile of whom we know nothing further (Luke i. 1—3). The “second treatise” begins in ver. 3, without being definitely spoken of here as the second. The writer indeed goes straight on from the mention of the apostles in ver. 2 in an unbroken sentence. On the connection between the Book of Acts and the Gospel, comp. p. 256 (and also p. 48).

2. *Taken up*, i.e. into heaven.—*Commandments* should be “commandment.” The commandment or commission here mentioned is given in ver. 4.

3. This forty days' intercourse of the risen Jesus with his disciples is only mentioned by the writer of the Book of Acts, who elsewhere (x. 41, xiii. 31) assumes that the intercourse between Jesus and the apostles after the resurrection lasted for some time. This view is contrary, however, not only to probability, but also to the other account given by the writer himself (Luke xxiv. 51).—[There is nothing in the Greek corresponding to the *infallible* of our translators.]

4. *And being assembled together with them* should be “And when he was eating with them.” Comp. x. 41, Luke xxiv 42.—*That they should not depart from Jerusalem*: According to the earlier representation of these events, the appearances of the risen Jesus took place in Galilee, whither Jesus had himself directed his disciples, Matt. xxviii. 10 sqq. For evident reasons these appearances were transferred in the later tradition to Jeru-

salem, the place where Jesus suffered and died, and where subsequently his disciples underwent their severest probation.—*Which ye have heard*: comp. Luke xxiv. 49.

5. Comp. xi. 16.

6. This is a different gathering from the one mentioned in ver. 4, and is the last at which he appears (see ver. 9).—That the disciples even after the death of Jesus still expected the establishment of a material kingdom, and indeed of a kingdom limited to Israel, is in itself quite probable. It was only very gradually and after severe struggles that the Christians became conscious of the purely spiritual purpose of the heavenly kingdom, and of its universality. Even the verse which here follows (7) does not break away entirely from the first idea.

8. This verse states the subject and contents of the Book of Acts. Hence the great stress and fulness of detail, as compared with Luke xxiv. 51, which characterize the description of the ascension. There are also many important differences between the two accounts.—It is doubtful whether Jesus himself actually gave the command to preach to the Gentiles. Comp. note on x. 42 and Luke xxiv. 47

10. The visions and appearances of angels which are so frequently met with in the Book of Acts give additional importance to the epochs with which they are connected. Comp. v. 19, viii. 26, ix. 4 sqq., x. 7, xii. 7 sqq., xvi. 9, xviii. 9, xxii. 17 sqq., xxvii. 23.

11. Consistently with the purpose of the book, the apostles are here directed to the earth as the scene of their labours, and are discouraged from the expectation of the immediate return of Jesus which prevailed in the apostolic age. Comp. note on ii. 17

12. The writer has transferred the scene of the ascension from Bethany, where the earlier account represents it as taking place, to the Mount of Olives. Comp. Luke xxiv. 51. A Sabbath-day's journey is two thousand paces; so that this would apply only to the Mount of Olives, not to Bethany.

13. *An upper room*: “The upper room” of a private house, comp. xii. 12.—See Luke vi. 14 sqq. [Brother of James should be “son of James;” see note on Matt. x. 3.]

14. *The women*: The writer probably means in the first place the women who remained with Jesus even after the flight of the

disciples, Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James. Luke xxiv. 10.—Mary the mother of Jesus, according to the unanimous testimony of the Evangelists, was not at first upon the side of Jesus, neither were his brothers (Luke viii. 19 sqq.). They must have been converted after the resurrection.

15. (*The number of names, &c.*), should be “(and there was a crowd of about a hundred and twenty persons together).”—The number a hundred and twenty is only approximate. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6) speaks of five hundred brethren to whom Jesus appeared in Galilee. Of this, indeed, the Book of Acts knows nothing; for it represents all the appearances of Jesus after the resurrection as taking place in Jerusalem, and the proclamation of the gospel as emanating entirely from Jerusalem.

18. The death of Judas, as described in this and the following verses, does not agree with the account given in Matt. xxvii. 3—10, according to which the field was purchased by the chief priests after the suicide of the traitor. It seems that we have here a legend originating in the name Aceldama and two disconnected passages in the Psalms. These two passages in the Psalms, which are quoted with some freedom by the writer from the Greek translation, contain in the original nothing that could be referred to the traitor.—The freedom with which the writer deals with his historical materials is evident from the incorrect assumption in verse 19 that Peter was speaking in Greek.

20. *His bishoprick* should be “his apostolic office.”

22. The Book of Acts lays the chief stress, not upon the death of Jesus upon the cross, which Paul regards as of decisive importance, but upon the external confirmation of the resurrection. In this the proof of Jesus’ Messianic office is looked for. Comp. pp. 262 sq.—*Be ordained to be*, “be made.”

23. The restoration of the number twelve assumes that these twelve apostles were originally intended only for the twelve tribes of Israel. This intention is distinctly expressed in Matt. x. 5 sq., and historically is indubitable. The Book of Acts, in spite of the very different position which it takes up, recognizes this as the original state of affairs (xiii. 46, xviii. 6), and it is certainly not a mere accident that the writer never assigns to Paul the name of apostle.—There are other evidences dating from the apostolic age of a successor to Judas having been

appointed: Paul, for example (1 Cor. xv. 5), and Rev. xii. 1, xxi. 14, assume that there are twelve apostles.—Of the two men from whom the choice was made nothing further is known. We must assume that both were considered equally fitted for the office.

26. *Gave forth their lots, “cast lots for them.”*

## CHAPTER ii.

The pouring out of the spirit. The first speech of Peter and its results.

1. *Pentecost*: By this we must understand the Jewish festival of first fruits, fifty days after the Passover. Probably on this day the memory of the delivery of the Law on Sinai was also celebrated. In both aspects the writer regards the Jewish festival as containing a significant prophetic reference to that which he here describes as fulfilled in Christianity.—We must not suppose that the temple is the place of their gathering. If it had been so, the writer would have indicated the fact in some way. It is rather a private house.

2. *Wind*: This is not to be taken literally. It only serves the writer as an image of the supernatural occurrence of the descent of the spirit, which is regarded in the light of a miracle.

3. *Cloven* should be “distributed.”—*It sat upon each of them*: i.e. the tongue-shaped fire.

4. *And began to speak with other tongues*: The sequel shows that what is meant is, that the Christians spoke miraculously in languages with which they had hitherto been unacquainted, and it neither increases nor decreases the miracle to suppose that the writer only intended to represent the foreigners as *hearing* their own languages, and not the apostles as actually *speaking* them. If the writer, however, had had in his mind any such artificial distinction between a miracle of *hearing* and a miracle of *speaking*, he must certainly have clearly indicated this in some part or other of his narrative. It is true that we cannot prove that a miraculous speaking in foreign languages is what is meant by “speaking in tongues” where it is mentioned in other parts of the book (as in x. 46, xix. 6); there, indeed, this would be a decidedly forced interpretation. The very fact, however, that the writer himself had never witnessed this phenomenon of the apostolic age, seems to have caused him to leave the vague

expression unexplained in passages where he had not, as he has here, other reasons for a fuller description of the occurrence. At any rate our author means something very different from that which the apostle Paul calls “speaking in tongues,” and concerning which he has left us evidence which is both unimpeachable and clear, 1 Cor. xiv. 2—33 (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10). Paul describes indistinct and disconnected utterances which were *unintelligible* to the hearers, and were the result of an enthusiasm and ecstasy in which the speaker himself lost all consciousness. It appears, then, that the first powerful manifestation of this peculiar phenomenon, which is one of the characteristics of the depth and vehemence of the new spirit of Christianity for which no words were sufficient, was afterwards transformed by legend into a power of speaking foreign languages, and this legend is then further developed by the author of the Book of Acts. The consciousness of the community that it possessed through Christ the holy spirit of God was incorporated in a legend of a *single extraordinary* occurrence which took place in Jerusalem, the source of the gospel, and which could only find its first expression in speech in foreign languages. According to the Old Testament narrative, the nations of the earth were separated by diversity of languages as a penalty for their disobedience to God. By the spirit of Christ, with its universal sway, they must be re-united. According to Jewish legend, when the Law was given, the voice of God was uttered in all the languages of the various nations. The Gospel, which was to be intelligible to all the world, must similarly be expressed from the first in a manner intelligible to all nations.—Possibly the occurrence narrated in 1 Cor. xv. 6 is the historical nucleus of the legend.

5. *Out of every nation*: This expression is not to be taken literally—*Devout men*: These are not Gentiles, but Israelites from foreign countries who were then residing in Jerusalem.

9. *Judea*: The language of the dwellers in Judea in the mouth of the Christians could not amaze any one. They are only added that they may not be found wanting in an enumeration of all possible nations.—*Asia* must here be understood in the narrower sense in which the name included the western districts of Asia Minor (Mysia, Lydia and Caria), with Ephesus as its capital. It is commonly spoken of as Proconsular Asia.

10. *Strangers of Rome* should be “sojourners from Rome.” *Jews and proselytes*: i.e. Jews and proselytes who had come to Jerusalem from the countries mentioned.

11. It was by no means the case that all these different countries had different languages. In many of them the language was the same. The writer is only concerned with a long enumeration of different countries, and he made no investigations on the subject of their languages. In his enumeration of the nations he is of course limited to that part of the world known to the ancients.

14. In the first section of the Book of Acts, Peter is always the spokesman of the primitive community at Jerusalem. In his speech (vv. 14—36) he starts from the phenomenon of speaking in foreign languages, in order that he may demonstrate from it that this is the Messianic time which was prophesied, and that Jesus is the Messiah.

15. *The third hour*: about nine o'clock in the morning. Before this first hour of prayer the Israelites might not partake of anything.

16. Comp. Joel iii. 1—5 [A. V ii. 28—32]. The Christians had the best grounds and the fullest opportunities for applying to themselves the Old Testament promise of the pouring forth of the spirit.

17. *In the last days*: i.e. before the last judgment of ver. 20, and, according to the ideas of our author, before the return of Christ, which (i. 7—11, and other passages) he expected would be soon, but not so soon as others looked for it; for example, the writer of the Revelation (Rev. i. 1, xxii. 6, 7, 20) or of the Gospel according to Matthew (Matt. x. 23, xxiv. 34). Comp. note on Acts iii. 21.

22. *Wonders and signs* are regarded throughout the Book of Acts as a testimony and a ground of belief, e.g. xv. 12, 16. Jesus expresses a different opinion, according to Matt. xii. 38, 39, xvi. 1—4; comp. John iv. 48.

23. This verse should read, “Who was delivered up to you according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hands of ungodly men have crucified and slain.” The guilt of the Israelites in the death of Jesus is strongly emphasized throughout the Book of Acts, e.g. iii. 13 sqq., iv. 10, &c.—The “ungodly” are the Romans.

**24.** *Not possible*: on account of the fulfilment of the passages from the Psalms which follow, and perhaps also because the writer regards Jesus as the “Prince of life,” iii. 15.

**25.** [*Foresaw* should be “beheld”]—Psalm xvi. 8—11. The passage is quoted for the sake of the last two verses, which are laxly interpreted of the resurrection of Jesus. Properly understood, they are simply a general expression of the confidence of the pious in the time of distress and mortal danger.

**28.** *With thy countenance* should be “before thy face,” i.e. in thy presence.

**30.** *That of the fruit of his loins, &c.*, should be “that he would set one of the fruit of his loins on the throne.” The reference is to Ps. cxxxii. 1, where the dominion of the descendants of David is spoken of.

**33.** *The promise of the Holy Ghost* should be “the promised holy spirit.”

**34, 35.** Free application to the Messiah of a passage in which an Israelitish king is originally spoken of. Ps. cx. 1.

**39.** *All that are afar off*: i.e. the Gentiles.—This passage corresponds entirely with the statement of the contents and plan of the work (i. 8). And the very fact that Peter has afterwards to be taught that the gospel is intended to be universal, and to extend even to the Gentiles, by means of a special divine command (x. 9 sqq., 34), only shows us how freely our writer has dealt with his historical materials, and especially with all that he puts into the mouth of his speakers.

**40.** *Untoward* should be “perverted.”

**41.** The number of 3000 conversions on one day must arouse considerable doubt. We have already learnt from i. 15 how inexact the writer is in his use of numbers. The disproportionately large number here given is explained partly by the natural tendency of legends to magnify everything, and partly by the great weight which the writer attaches to the first grand miraculous action of the spirit.

**42.** *In the apostles' doctrine and fellowship*: “In the apostles' teaching and in fellowship.”—*Breaking of bread* denotes social meals when the Lord's Supper was taken, called *ágapai*.

**43.** The Book of Acts represents the apostles as enjoying an amount of respect and influence among the non-christian popu-

lation which certainly passes far beyond the limits of historical probability (ii. 47, iv. 21, v. 11, 12, 16, 26).

**44, 45.** In such an entire abolition of private property, we recognize the true spirit of Christ, even though we cannot but recognize the actual enforcement of it, in the manner and to the extent here described, as impracticable and legendary. The apostle Paul knows nothing of any such thorough-going community of property, and the Book of Acts itself cannot conceal the fact that in the Christian community at Jerusalem there were poor persons on the one hand (vi. 1) and householders on the other hand (xii. 12). Moreover, the Book of Acts (v. 4) represents this community of goods not as a compulsory regulation, but only as a fact.

**46.** The appearance of the first Christians in the temple, to which other passages in the Book of Acts testify (iii. 1, 8, 11, v. 12, 21, 42), shows the still unbroken connection between Christianity and Judaism.

**47.** *And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved:* “And the Lord added daily those who were being saved.”

### iii. 1—iv. 31.

The healing of a lame man by Peter, and his new proclamation of the gospel before the people and before the high council.

## CHAPTER iii.

**1.** *The ninth hour:* about three o'clock in the afternoon.

**2.** The gate of the temple here spoken of was probably at the eastern entrance.

**4.** *Look on us:* These words are intended to fix upon the apostle the attention not only of the sick man, but also of all the spectators and of all readers.

**6** sqq. There is no mention here of the faith which Jesus demanded of those whom he healed. The miracle is evidently introduced for its own sake, to show the astonishing results of the apostolic power, the impression made by the gospel, and the testimony borne to it. Compare, in contrast to this, e.g., Matt. ix. 22, 29, 30.

**11.** *The porch that is called Solomon's:* a portico on the east side of the temple.

**12.** *At this* should be “at this man.”—Peter’s speech, which here follows, again (like his first speech, ii. 14 sqq.) deduces the Messianic dignity of Jesus from the miracle that has taken place, and then proceeds to call the people to conversion, in order that at the second coming of Christ they also may be participators of the blessings of his kingdom, which are destined in the first place for the Israelites.

**13.** [*Son*: The word here rendered “son” means in the first place “child,” either boy or girl, but is used both in classical Greek and in the New Testament in the sense of “servant” (e.g. Matt. viii. 6, 13; Luke i. 54, 69, xii. 45, “the men-servants,” xv. 26, &c.). It is applied to Jesus by the writer of the Book of Acts in iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30, and should probably be rendered “servant” in these passages.]—*When* should be “although.”

**15.** In the words *Prince* (or “author”) *of life*, we find the one solitary and vague indication of the higher conception of the nature of the person of Jesus, which is otherwise entirely wanting in the Book of Acts.

**16.** *Through* should be “on account of.”—The faith here meant is the faith of the apostle. Comp. note on vv. 6 sqq.

**17.** *Through ignorance*: i.e. not being aware of the Messiahship of Jesus.—This mild condemnation, taken in connection with the rest of the narrative, only serves to increase the guilt of the Israelites, inasmuch as in the sequel by their obstinacy they show themselves to be quite unworthy of the clemency which is offered to them. Comp. further note on ii. 23.

**19.** The blotting out of sin takes place, according to the Book of Acts, through baptism, upon which the greatest stress is laid throughout the book (ii. 38). There is no mention at all of reconciliation simply through grace offered in the death of Christ upon the cross. The teaching of Paul is different (1 Cor. i. 17; Rom. vi. 4).—*The times of refreshment*: i.e. after the return of Christ.

**21.** *Until the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken*, should be “Until the times of the restoration of all things of which God hath spoken.”—*The times of the restoration* are not the same as *the times of refreshment*; i.e. the phrase refers not to the return of Christ, but to the intermediate period between the first and second coming, during which, according to the view of

the writer, the kingdom of God will be prepared in the appointed manner by the separation of those who receive it from those who do not. This is the same as *the last days* of ii. 17—21.

**22.** *For Moses truly said unto the fathers,* should be “*For Moses said.*”—In this and the following verse we have again a passage from the Old Testament loosely quoted from memory and loosely applied to the Messiah (Deut. xviii. 15).

**24.** *These days,* which have now already begun.

**25.** *Thy seed here* as in Gal. iii. 16 is Christ.

**26.** [*Son*: see note on ver. 13].—*Unto you first:* If we consider the speech as the production of the writer, we see here, as everywhere else, his own view of the historical course of the development of Christianity. The gospel was not intended for the Israelites first of all, but all the same it was first preached to them, and in consequence of their rejection of it it took its way to the Gentiles.—The statement (made here and in ver. 25) that the gospel was intended for all nations is impossible at this time in the mouth of Peter (comp. x. 9 sqq., 34 sq.). We have the more reason then for regarding it as the fundamental principle of the writer of the Book of Acts.

#### CHAPTER iv.

**1.** The Sadducees appear throughout the Book of Acts as the worst opponents of Christianity, while the Pharisees approach more nearly to it (v. 17, 34, xv. 5, xxiii. 6 sqq.). According to the gospel history, on the other hand, and all other indications, the Sadducees, who had no points of contact with the gospel, were indifferent to it, while the Pharisees were its chief opponents. (Comp. Matt. xxiii. 1 sqq., and the Pharisee Paul, Gal. i. 13.) It is probably only for the sake of supporting his own fundamental principle that the writer of Acts brings forward the doctrinal disagreement with the Sadducees in regard to the resurrection of the dead, and thereby throws into the background the Pauline opposition to the law (iv. 2, xxiii. 6 sqq. Comp. also p. 260).

**4.** See note on ii. 41.

**6.** Here, as in Luke iii. 2, Annas appears as the officiating high-priest. As a matter of fact it was Caiaphas who then filled the office, although Annas still exercised considerable authority

after his deposition in the year 14 A.D.—Of John and Alexander we know nothing definite.

**7.** The question can only be intended to extort from the apostles a criminal acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah.

**10—12.** A solemn proclamation of the gospel to Israel, whereby the subsequent rejection of Jesus on the part of the Jews is rendered inexcusable.

**11.** Comp. Matt. xxi. 42, Psalm cxviii. 22.

**13.** This verse should be rendered, “But when they perceived the joy [better ‘boldness,’ as in A.V.] The word means, properly, ‘freedom of speech’] of Peter and John, and had learned that they were unlearned folk and laymen, they marvelled, and recognized them at once as having been with Jesus.”—This astonishment, and not recognizing the apostles till now as laymen and disciples of Jesus, is scarcely credible (comp. ii. 41, 43).

**16—21.** The account here given of the proceedings of the high council is rendered so incredible by the acknowledgment in ver. 16, and the utter aimlessness of the threat in ver. 17 after this, that we can only suppose that the writer has dealt with great freedom with the historical materials that lay before him. Perhaps his materials had already been moulded to some extent in favour of Christianity in the course of tradition. Testimony to the gospel in the mouth of its enemies naturally appeared particularly serviceable for his purpose.

**19, 20.** Freedom from every restrictive external influence based upon the deepest sacred inner necessity.

**24.** *Lord, thou art God, which hast made,* should be “Lord, it is thou who hast made.”—That they should utter a free prayer of this kind *with one accord* is scarcely credible. The writer does not seem to have had any special authority for this, any more than for the speeches put in the mouth of the apostles.

**25.** *People:* “peoples.”—Comp. Ps. ii. 1. The Jews regarded all anonymous psalms as Davidic.

**27.** Herod Antipas (according to our author’s gospel alone, Luke xxiii. 11) had mocked Jesus.—[*Child*: see iii. 13.]

**30.** Here again belief is based upon signs and wonders, and the earthquake in the next verse corresponds with this view as a miraculous sign that the prayer is heard. (Comp. note on ii. 22.) [*Child*: see iii. 13.]

## iv. 32—v. 16.

The power of the holy spirit in the Christian community: Community of goods, a punitive miracle performed by Peter, the growth of the Church.

**33.** *Great grace*: i. e. great favour with the people.

**34.** This further advance in the practice of community of goods of ii. 44 sq. must be judged by the remarks there made.

**36** sq. Corresponding to this eminent example of self-denial in community of goods, we have in v. 1 a similarly eminent instance of the desecration of this working of the holy spirit by hypocrisy and selfishness, the consequence of which is a punitive miracle performed by Peter.—*Barnabas* is the subsequent companion of the apostle Paul, and the mediator between him and the primitive community in Jerusalem (ix. 27, xi. 25 sq., 30, xii. 25, &c.).

## CHAPTER V.

**1.** The example here given of the exercise of miraculous powers of punishment on the part of Peter, taken in connection with the context, serves essentially to exalt the idea of the apostolic power. This exalted idea, however, does not agree with the picture of the apostolic age which we find in the Pauline Epistles.—We know nothing further of the man and wife here mentioned.

**3** sq. Peter is here placed on a complete equality with the holy spirit which speaks through him.

**4.** *Whiles it remained*: i. e. remained unsold.—*Was it not thine own?* should be “did it not remain thine own?”

**5.** The effect of the words of Peter, in the connection in which it is found, can only be understood as a miracle. Every natural explanation is absurd.

**8.** *And Peter answered unto her*: i. e. to her greeting.

**9.** Three hours elapse (comp. ver. 7) before those who have gone to bury Ananias return. The “unclean” burial-places were at a considerable distance from the city.

**10.** It would be an injustice to the writer to condemn or even to judge this miracle on purely moral grounds. The only point in the writer’s mind is the high idea of the first effects of the holy spirit which he intends to convey by it. The general remarks in vv. 11, 12, serve the same purpose. (Comp. ii. 43.)

**12.** The mark of parenthesis before *and* should be omitted here, and placed at the beginning of ver. 14.—*Solomon's porch*: see note on iii. 11.

**13.** The reverent fear of the Christians on the part of the people as here described is very improbable in itself, but fits in very well with the rest of our author's picture.

**14.** As the *insomuch that* of verse 15 is directly connected with ver. 13, this verse must be regarded as an interpolation.—*And believers were the more added to the Lord*, should be “And more and more believers were added to the Lord.”

**15.** As here wonderful cures are said to have been produced by the shadow of Peter, so in xix. 11 sq. the same effects are said to be produced by the handkerchiefs of Paul. This mythical exaggeration of the idea of the power of the apostles actually goes beyond any well-authenticated historical account of the healings performed by Jesus himself, and is only to be explained as the production of legend, and from the later standpoint of the writer of the book.

#### v. 17—42.

New victory over the enemy.

**17** *The high priest*: according to iv. 6, Annas, but in reality Caiaphas.—*Sadducees*: see note on iv. 1.

**18.** *In the common prison* should be “into public ward.”

**19.** The deliverance by means of the angel does not really alter the position of the apostles at all. It only serves, in the connection in which it stands, as a new miraculous divine testimony to the gospel. Comp. notes on iv. 16 sqq. and i. 10.

**24.** *The chief priests*: i.e. those who were of high-priestly family, and the heads of the different classes of priests.—*They doubted of them*: “they were perplexed about them.”

**34** sqq. Gamaliel was the grandson of the famous doctor of the law, Hillel. According to xxii. 3, he was the teacher of the apostle Paul, and he was otherwise known as a celebrated teacher.—That the speech which follows is uttered by a Pharisee, is consistent with the close connection which the writer of the Book of Acts assumes to have existed between Pharisaism and Christianity, to which attention has been called in the note on iv. 1. The speech itself, however, is undoubtedly rather an expression of Christian thought and the wish of the Christians, than an oration

really delivered in the Jewish Sanhedrim. For even supposing it to be historically correct that the high council did at that time abstain from further persecution of the Christians by the advice of Gamaliel, it is still impossible that he should have appealed to the example of Theudas, who, according to Josephus, Ant. xx. 5, 1, appeared about the year 44 A.D., in the reign of Claudius, i.e. about ten years after the occurrence of the event here narrated. Neither would he have sought to dissuade them from the use of force by two examples of risings which were distinctly crushed by force. The advice of Gamaliel, from whom moreover Paul learnt only to persecute the gospel with the utmost zeal, really depicts the desire of the writer of the Book of Acts in regard to the relation of the civil power to the gospel.

**36.** *Before these days*: comp. note on ver. 34.

**37.** *The days of the taxing*: the census referred to in Luke ii. 2, taken by Quirinius, proconsul of the province of Syria, in the year 7 A.D.—*Judas of Galilee*, also known as “the Gaulonite,” from his birthplace Gamala in the trans-Jordanic district of Gaulonitis, regarded this taxing by the Roman emperor as an attack upon Jehovah, the sole Lord of Israel, and succeeded in raising a great rebellion against it, which was even favoured by a part of the Pharisees.

**40.** If the advice of Gamaliel commended itself to the council, the scourging is difficult to understand. The writer seems here to come into collision, in his narrative, with his own speech in the mouth of Gamaliel.

vi. 1—viii. 3.

Appointment of deacons; accusation against Stephen and his defence; persecution and the first dispersion of the community.

## CHAPTER vi.

**1.** *Grecians* should be “Hellenists,” i.e. Greek-speaking Jews, and hence for the most part persons who had formerly been heathens, who had embraced Judaism and had subsequently become Christians. The *Hebrews* are Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians.—In this account of the neglect of the Hellenists by the Hebrews, the truth of which we have no reason to doubt, we have probably the earliest trace of the opposition between Jewish and Gentile Christians which afterwards was so deep-seated and

powerful. It is, however, to a considerable extent concealed under the statements of the latter part of the account, which does not practically go into this charge, which is directed against the apostles also, of neglect of the Hellenists, the whole narrative being introduced simply on account of the appointment of deacons. Comp. notes on vii. 1 sqq., viii. 5.

3. *The Holy Ghost*: “spirit.”

5. The deacons or almoners here mentioned seem from their names to have been Hellenists. Certainly Nicholas must have been, and also (on account of vv. 8 sqq.) Stephen. The Book of Acts gives us no further information about any of them except Stephen and Philip (viii. 5 sqq., xxi. 8).—About the office of deacons we have no further information either from this book or from other sources, not even in passages in which we might fairly expect to find it, e.g. xi. 30.

8. *Full of faith and power* should be “full of grace and the power of the spirit.”

9. In Jerusalem there was a great number of synagogues, especially of foreign Jews. The Libertines, as their Roman name shows, were Jews who had been Roman slaves and afterwards obtained their liberty again. Their synagogue appears to have served at the same time for the Africans from Cyrene and Alexandria. Paul, who was afterwards the apostle, may have belonged at this time to the synagogue of the Cilicians, comp. xxi. 39. The fact that here, as in ix. 29, a portion of the Hellenistic Jews appear as especially zealous enemies of the gospel, does not contradict what was said in the note on vi. 1.—*Asia*: see note on ii. 9.

13. According to the contents of the speech which follows, these were not *false witnesses* from the Jewish point of view.

## CHAPTER vii.

1 sqq. The long speech which here follows turns the defence of Stephen and the gospel against the Jews into the bitterest attack upon the Israelites. This complaint culminates in the charge that the Jews always resist the holy spirit (ver. 51), the proof of this being drawn from the history of Israel, which in all ages shows alike the grace of God which is offered to men, and the ungrateful resistance of the people. Practically there is

nothing more in the speech than the condemnation of Judaism which we find throughout the book, nothing to necessitate the supposition that the writer derived it from any special source (comp. p. 266). The rejection of the temple service (vv. 47 sqq.) is easily intelligible in the mouth of our author when we consider the late date of the book, after the destruction of the temple, and it also underlies the words of xviii. 24. This speech does not really contain that freer interpretation of the law, somewhat in accordance with the ideas of the apostle Paul, which is usually looked for in it. On the contrary, it distinctly blames the Jews for not having kept the law (ver. 53). The Book of Acts has not represented Stephen as a precursor of Paul. Still, from the fact that the writer first introduces the rejection of Judaism and the temple service in the mouth of the Hellenist Stephen, we may probably infer that he had before him some tradition in which Stephen was the representative of a freer school that stood in opposition to Judaism, and that his martyr's death was the consequence of this. Comp. note on vi. 1.

2 sqq. In the time of the patriarchs the loving care of God for his people appears most clearly. By it Abraham is conducted in all his wanderings, and through it he receives the promises.—According to Gen. xii. 1 sqq., the divine command to emigrate was not given to Abraham until he dwelt in Haran [here called Charran]. The command is here, as in other ancient writers, confused with the command to depart from Ur in Chaldea which is alluded to in Gen. xv. 7 and other passages. [In Gen. xii. 1, *Now the LORD had said* should be “And the LORD said.”]

4. *When his father was dead*: This is inferred from Gen. xi. 32; but it involves an inconsistency in the chronology, since Abraham was born in his father's seventieth year, the latter lived to the age of 205, and Abraham was only 75 when he left Haran. Hence the inference is erroneous.

5. *When as yet he had no child*: These words mark distinctly how precious the divine promise was. For this reason the promises themselves (Gen. xv. 13 sq., Exod. iii. 12) are afterwards given, and in verse 8 circumcision is spoken of as the sign of the covenant of grace and of the promise.

9 sqq. The sons of Jacob also, in spite of their sins, are conducted to Joseph by the providential care of God; nevertheless

they had no place given them in the land promised to the descendants of Abraham. Their very sepulchre had been purchased.

12. *First* : “the first time.”

14. *Three score and fifteen souls* : this was the number according to the Greek version of the Old Testament, which the Book of Acts follows throughout. According to the Hebrew text there were only seventy (Gen. xlvi. 27 ; Exod. i. 5 ; Deut. x. 22).

16. According to Gen. xlix. 30 [and l. 13] Jacob was buried in the cave of Machpela near Hebron. Of the burial-place of his sons, with the exception of Joseph, there is no mention in the Old Testament. In the next place, Abraham did not purchase the cave from Hamor [here called Emmor], but from Ephron the Hittite (Gen. xxiii. 17 sqq.), while Jacob purchased a field from the sons of Hamor (Gen. xxxii. 19), which, according to Joshua xxiv. 32, was the burial-place of Joseph. The Book of Acts appears to follow the later Jewish tradition here, and purposely to emphasize the despised Samaritan Sichem, in order to bring out the homelessness of the patriarchs in Canaan.—[*The father of Sychem* : The German version here reads “in Sychem,” which is corrected in the commentary to “the father of Sychem.” This is not, however, the reading of the best MSS., which have either “who was in Sychem,” or simply “in Sychem”].

17 sqq. The history of Moses brings out the fulfilment of the promise, but also at the same time the stiff-necked opposition of the people to the messenger of God. Hence he is here represented as a forerunner and prophecy of Christ. See vv. 25, 27 sqq., 35, 39 sqq.

19. *And evil entreated our fathers so that they cast out their young children*, should be, “and tormented our fathers so that they exposed their children.”

20. *Exceeding fair* : “fair before God.”

21. *Cast out* should be “exposed.”

22. [*Was learned* : i.e. “was taught or instructed.”]—*Mighty in words* : the writer seems to have forgotten Exod. iv. 10 sqq.—The education of Moses in the wisdom of the Egyptians is not mentioned in the Old Testament.

25. *Would deliver them* : “was giving them salvation.”

26. The occurrence here narrated is invested with a much

higher significance than it bears in the Old Testament. To some extent also it is altered to make it serve the purpose for which it is here intended: it is not Pharaoh, but the intractable Israelites who compel Moses to take flight, and hence a single Israelite's failure to recognize the authority of Moses is treated as his rejection by the whole people (ver. 35).—*Would have set them at one again* should be “urged them to peace.”

[34. *I have seen, I have seen*: lit. “Seeing, I have seen,” a Hebraism for “I have assuredly seen.”]

35. *Deliverer* should be “redeemer,” but it is only as a prophetic type of Christ that Moses can be called a redeemer. Comp. ver. 37.—*By the hand of the angel*: i.e. “with the help of the angel.” In accordance with the later Jewish theology, especially the Alexandrian, the angel of God is introduced even in places where the Old Testament speaks distinctly of a direct revelation of Jehovah upon earth. Comp. ver. 53 and Gal. iii. 19.

38. See Exod. xix.—*The lively oracles* should be “living words,” i.e. the law, with the neglect of which the Israelites are charged in ver. 53. According to Paul, on the other hand (Gal. iii. 21), the law is altogether incapable of giving life.

40. *Gods*: according to the original Hebrew, simply “a god,” as indeed Aaron actually made only one image.

42. *The host of heaven*: i.e. the stars. Comp. Amos v. 25 sqq. This verse gives us, as early as the time of the ancient prophet, a different picture of the worship of Jehovah in the desert from that which we find in the Pentateuch.

43. *Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of your god Remphan*, should be “And ye bore the tent of Moloch and the constellation of your god Remphan.”—*Moloch*: a Canaanite idol which was worshipped with human sacrifices. The writer follows the Greek text; the expression in the original is more general, “your king.”—*Remphan*: probably Saturn.—*Babylon*: The Old Testament has “Damascus.” The writer alters the passage according to his requirements.

44 sqq. In regard to the national sanctuary also God has fulfilled his promise (ver. 7). But in this also the people, and especially Solomon, resisted God by building the temple. Comp. note on vv. 1 sqq.

45. *Which also our fathers, &c.*, should be “Which also our

fathers received, and brought it with Joshua into the land when they took possession of the nations whom God thrust out,” &c.—*Unto the days of David* belongs to *brought it into the land*, so that it was there until the days of David.

**46.** *Desired*: “asked.”—That David found favour is said in order to explain his petition.—On the total rejection of the temple worship, comp. note on vv. 1 sq.—This idea is not found among Christian writers earlier than the second century.

**51.** Final condemnation of the Israelites. Comp. note on vv. 1 sqq.—*Uncircumcised in heart and ears*: circumcision being regarded as a rite of purification.

**52.** Comp. Matt. xxiii. 34 sq.—*The just one*: “the righteous one,” i.e. Jesus. Here the writer passes on to the present and so brings the speech to a conclusion.

**53.** See note on ver. 35.

**57** A judicial sentence must have been pronounced before this, as we see from the mention of the witnesses afterwards. But the description of the tumultuous proceedings before the high council throws doubt on the accuracy of the details of the whole account.

**58.** It was the duty of the witnesses to cast the first stones. For this purpose they took off their upper garments.—Paul is here purposely introduced. As Paul in the year 60 speaks of himself as an old man (Philem. 9), he could scarcely have been a *young man* in the year 36.

[**59.** *Calling upon God*: The Greek is simply “calling upon” or “invoking,” without mention of any person.]

[**60.** The words, *And Saul was consenting unto his death*, in viii. 1, should form the conclusion of this verse.]

## CHAPTER viii.

**1.** *At that time there was*: “There arose at that time.”—*All*: Philip at any rate (ver. 26) was still at Jerusalem, and probably others also.

**2.** The writer does not pursue any further the history of the spread of the gospel in Judea. He is now concerned with Samaria, which as a semi-heathen land affords the transition to the second great division of his narrative.

viii. 4—40.

Spread of the gospel in Samaria and elsewhere.

5. *The city of Samaria*: “a city in Samaria.”—Philip is the deacon, not the apostle (comp. xxi. 8 sq.). In these operations of Philip in Samaria, which certainly went beyond the original ideas of the disciples (comp. Matt. x. 5), we may find confirmation of the supposition expressed above in the note on vi. 1, that the Hellenists were the representatives of a freer school, as opposed to the national Judaism.

6. *Hearing and seeing* should be “when they heard and saw.”

9 sqq. *But there was, &c.*, should be “But there was before-time a man, by name Simon, in the city, who practised sorcery and amazed the Samaritan people.”—The occurrence here narrated, which is connected with the name of Simon, arouses considerable suspicions. In the first place, it is not historically accurate to represent the apostles as having the sole privilege of imparting the holy spirit. There is no other statement to this effect, and it is inconsistent with other accounts in the Book of Acts itself. (Comp. viii. 26 sqq., ix. 1 sq., x. 44, xi. 22 sqq.) The assumption in ver. 18, that the holy spirit appeared in visible form, is similarly doubtful. Finally, as the whole affair leads to nothing (ver. 24), and cannot even be regarded as a miraculous punishment, the writer cannot have introduced it for its own sake. Hence we cannot decide whether the narrative has a foundation in fact, and whether this Simon is the Simon mentioned in Josephus’ *Antiquities*, xx. 7, 2. At the same time, it is the more certain that we have here a fragment of the Simon-myth which spread far and wide in various forms, and was so freely employed in the post-apostolic age, making this Simon the father of all Gnostic heresies, and especially persecuting under his name the apostle Paul, who was so hateful to the Jewish Christians. The writer of the Book of Acts, however, seems to have wished expressly to avoid this identification of the great apostle with the magian by introducing this narrative into the account of the first appearances of Paul on the scene.—[On the name magian, see note on “wise men” in Matt. ii. 1.]

10 sq. It is not clear from this whether it is meant that Simon had himself given out that he was the Messiah. The vague expression of verse 11 is best explained on the supposition

that this verse is an early instance of the later charge made by the ecclesiastical writers against the mythical Simon, of having deified himself.

11. *Bewitched* should be “amazed.”

13. How formal the writer’s conception of belief was, is evident from the fact that he himself speaks of Simon’s outward adhesion to Christianity as “belief.” This is the later ecclesiastical expression.—[*Wondercl* should be “was amazed,” the word being similar to the one used in vv. 9, 11, and probably chosen by the writer on that account.]

14. The Book of Acts attempts here, as in xi. 22 sqq., to maintain a connection between the original community and the Gentile Church which was now coming into existence, but it does not adhere strictly to the historical facts in this attempt (comp note on vv. 9 sqq.).

23. This verse should read, “For I perceive that thou art fallen into bitter gall and the bond of unrighteousness.”

26 sqq. The conversion of the chamberlain from Ethiopia is a further step in the transition of the gospel to the heathen, and hence is introduced by an express divine command.—*Which is desert*: The particular road is thus pointed out because there were several ways from Jerusalem to Gaza.

27 The fact that queen Candace’s chamberlain was a eunuch is probably mentioned in order to show that he was not an Israelite by birth, although he worshipped the God of Israel. Hence he was probably one of the proselytes of the gate, as they were called. The sincere readiness with which the first heathen receives the gospel should be noticed (comp. vv. 30, 31, 36).—What is here called Ethiopia is the land of Meroe lying between the upper branches of the Nile, the warlike queens of which all bore the name and title of Candace.

32. Is. liii. 7, 8. The translation of the Hebrew is not quite exact.

33. *In his humiliation*, &c., should be “In his humiliation his sentence was annulled, but who can describe his times?”

37. This verse is an early interpolation and must be omitted.

39. The sudden disappearance of Philip and his removal to Ashdod [A.V Azotus], about twenty miles from Gaza, on the coast of Philistia, is regarded by the writer as a sign of the won-

derful and special preparations of God for this first conversion of a Gentile. We have already seen the same thing in vv. 26, 29 (comp. note on x. 1).

ix. 1—30.

Conversion of the apostle of the Gentiles, and his first labours.

### CHAPTER ix.

**1** sqq. The conversion of Paul is the most important step in the transition of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles. It has therefore been indirectly prepared for by the whole narrative from vi. onwards, and directly by vii. 58 and viii. 3, and is purposely introduced immediately before the account of the first conversion of a thorough Gentile by an apostle. See ch. x.

**2.** *To the synagogues*: i. e. to the rulers of the synagogues.—*Any of this way*: i. e. any attached to the sect of the Christians. The writer assumes that there were Christians in Damascus as in Galilee (ver. 31), without having given any account of the spread of Christianity there. This shows how little he was concerned to give a mission history in the proper sense of the words.

**3.** The purpose of the narrative which here follows is to describe a miraculous occurrence, and consequently every attempt at a natural explanation must do violence to the text. The conversion of Paul is here founded, not upon an inner experience, but upon an external miraculous appearance. Hence every inner preparation and spiritual communication is here excluded. The following considerations, however, will show us how inexact the writer is, and how little reason we have for supposing that his account is derived from any written source. In the first place, he relates the same occurrence in three different passages (see xxii. 6 sqq., xxvi. 13 sqq.), in which both the words of Jesus and also the miraculous appearance differ essentially; so that what Jesus says to Ananias (ix. 15) is afterwards addressed by him to Paul (xxvi. 16 sq.). And in the next place, on comparing these accounts with Paul's own account in Gal. i. 15 sqq., 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8 sq., we find there no mention of words spoken by Jesus, nor of any definite and miraculous effects of light and sound; while on the other hand we do find it there stated that the apostle saw the risen One, of which again there is no mention anywhere else in the book. The writer of the Book of Acts

makes use of this physical miracle in order to establish securely the reputation of the hated and persecuted apostle of the Gentiles, and divinely to attest his right to the apostolic office, and the authority of his Gentile-Christian gospel. Hence also the introduction of the second and third vision (vv. 10, 12), and the miraculous cure of his blindness (ver. 18).

**5.** *It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks:* These words should be omitted.

**6.** *[And he trembling unto him:* This part of the verse should be omitted, for the same reason as the words mentioned in the note on ver. 5. They are not to be found in any known Greek MS.; the reading of the MSS. being simply, “I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But arise, and go into the city.” &c.]—According to xxvi. 16 sqq., Jesus himself at once makes known to the apostle his future calling. Here, and in xxii. 10, he is represented as first learning it from Ananias in Damascus. Similarly ver. 7 is inconsistent with xxvi. 14 and xxii. 9.

**8.** *No man* should be “nothing.”

**10.** The writer, in support of the leading idea of his book, represents the calling of Paul to be the apostle to the Gentiles as being effected through the instrumentality of a man devoted to the law (comp. vv. 12, 17, xxii. 12—15). The apostle himself, on the contrary, is conscious of the immediate and divine origin of his apostolic office and his gospel (Gal. i. 11 sqq.). We can no longer determine what historical or traditional foundation there may have been for the account we find given here.

**11.** The Straight Street is the well-known main street of Damascus.

**12.** Paul’s sufferings also testify to his apostolic right, and are therefore almost always announced to him directly by God (xvi. 9, xviii. 9, xx. 23, 25, xxi. 11, xxii. 18, xxiii. 11).

**20** sq. Here, and in what afterwards follows, the description given of Paul’s first labours and his relation to the primitive community and the apostles at Jerusalem is essentially contradictory to his own account (Gal. i. 15—24). According to Gal. i. 16, Paul can never have made his appearance as an apostle among the Jews. Here he appears as such at once in Damascus and Jerusalem, vv. 20—27. According to Gal. i. 17 sq., Paul retired first of all to Arabia, and allowed three years to pass

before going up for the first time to Jerusalem. Here there is no mention of this. Finally, in Gal. i. 17 sqq., the apostle distinctly and emphatically states that his gospel and apostolic office are independent of the first apostles. Here this independence is thrown into the shade, and a very intimate connection with the first apostles is affirmed, vv. 27, 28.

**20.** There is no room here, nor in ver. 23, nor between 25 and 26, for the residence in Arabia of Gal. i. 17 sq.

**22.** *Very Christ*: “the Christ.”

**24** sq. This account is confirmed by the apostle’s own narrative in 2 Cor. xi. 32 sq., except that there it was not the Jews, but the ethnarch of king Aretas who endeavoured to apprehend Paul.

**25.** *By the wall*: “through the wall.”

**27.** By the mention of *the apostles* generally cannot be intended only Peter and James the brother of Christ, as in Gal. i. 18.—On the position of Barnabas as a mediator, comp. note on iv. 36. Paul does not mention him at all in connection with his first visit to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18), but only afterwards, and then simply as a companion of his own way of thinking. (Gal. ii. 1, 11—13.)

**29.** According to xxvi. 20, Paul preached Christ throughout all Judea. Comp. note on ver. 20.—*Grecians* should be “Hellenists.” Stephen had already contended with the Jewish Hellenists (vi. 9 sqq.).—According to xxii. 17 sqq., there was a different reason for Paul’s departure, and it took place in consequence of a vision. Comp. note on the passage.

ix. 31—xxviii. 31.

Second of the two great divisions of the Book of Acts. The spread of the gospel in the heathen world.

ix. 31—xi. 18.

Consecration and defence of the mission to the Gentiles by Peter.

**31.** In the words of this verse we have the formal conclusion of the first part of the book, and at the same time an introduction to the second part.—*The churches were edified were multiplied*, should be “the church was edified was multiplied.”

**32.** *Lydda* is the ancient Lod, afterwards called Diospolis, on the Philistine coast.

35. *Saron* is the Philistine plain between Joppa and Cæsarea.

36. *Dorcas*: i.e. gazelle.

37. The miracle is formally prepared for by the laying of the body in the upper chamber, as if it was expected.

38. *Desiring him*, &c., should be “entreating; delay not to come to us.”

39. *Which Dorcas made*, &c., should be “which Dorcas has made as long as she was with them.”

43. The occupation of tanning was regarded by the Israelites as unclean (comp. x. 6). Hence Peter’s residence with Simon is probably only mentioned in order that the writer, in setting forth the beginning of the mission beyond Jerusalem, may also set forth the beginning of the emancipation from the Mosaic law which is established in what follows.

#### CHAPTER X.

1. The account given in this chapter of the conversion of Gentiles by Peter arouses the most serious suspicions as to its genuineness. According to xi. 18, it finally settles the question as to the reception of the Gentiles into Christianity without requiring the observance of the law, on the ground of an express command of God, for which solemn preparation has been made; whereas both the Book of Acts itself (xv. 1 sqq.) and the Epistle to the Galatians, especially the latter, show us that at the time here referred to the question was by no means settled, and that Peter, above all, cannot then have received a direct divine command concerning it. On the other hand, it is entirely in keeping with the general view taken by the writer of the Book of Acts, that when he passes on to the mission to the Gentiles the main question should be decided by God himself in a solemn and miraculous manner, and that the person for whom this decision is made should be not Paul but Peter. The Pauline preaching to the Gentiles, which was so strongly opposed, is thus removed to the primitive community, and all the edge is taken off the opposition between the Pauline and the primitive Christian gospels. It is no longer possible to determine on what historical fact or tradition this narrative rested.—*The Italian band* is a Roman cohort of Italians, not of natives.

2. It must remain uncertain whether by the expression here

used Cornelius is intended to be described as a proselyte of the gate, like the eunuch of viii. 27, or whether he is to be regarded as occupying a position of perfect freedom in reference to Judaism. In either case his conversion depicts the reception into Christianity of one formerly a heathen (vv. 28, 34 sqq., xi. 1 sqq., 18, xv. 7), and the greatest stress is here laid upon the readiness of the Gentile to receive the gospel (vv. 4, 22, 25, 30, &c.).

[3. *Evidently, i.e. plainly.]*

6. *He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do:* a later addition.

11 sqq. By this vision, the Old Testament distinction between clean and unclean meats is abolished, and thereby the first hindrance of intercourse with the Gentiles and their reception into Christianity is removed.

12. *All manner of four-footed beasts of the earth and wild beasts and creeping things,* should be “all four-footed and creeping beasts of the earth.”

[22. *Was warned from God:* more strictly, “received an oracle,” or “received a divine command.”]

28. *How that it is an unlawful thing, &c.,* should be “how unlawful it is for a Jew to attach himself to a foreigner or to visit him.”—The prohibition here stated goes beyond the Jewish law and the custom of the Jews. The separation between the Jews and the Gentiles is here probably exaggerated, in order to make the abolition of it in Christianity the more marked.

30. *Four days:* the time which had actually elapsed since the vision (comp. vv. 8, 9, 23 sq.).

34 sqq. The purpose of this speech is set forth in the two first verses and in the conclusion, ver. 43, namely, to declare the principle of the abolition of the national and religious distinction between Jews and Gentiles in Christianity, which, instead of descent from Abraham and circumcision, requires only piety of heart. Still there is no declaration of the abolition of the observance of the law for those who were formerly Jews, either here or in chapter xv. On the contrary, it is assumed that they are under an obligation to observe it.—Except for this, the speech only contains just the same that we have found everywhere else in the Book of Acts.

36, 37. These two verses should read, “Ye know the word which he sent to the children of Israel, causing peace to be

preached through Jesus Christ (he is a Lord over all). Ye know the things that have taken place throughout all Judea, having begun from Galilee after the baptism which John preached.” The sentence is here interrupted by the leading thought that Jesus is Lord over all (hence also over the Gentiles), and then taken up again with the words, “Ye know,” &c., in ver. 37

**38.** On this view of Christ, see pp. 262 sq.

**41.** See note on i. 3.

**42.** According to i. 8 and Luke xxiv. 47, Jesus himself at the same time gave the command to preach to the Gentiles. The reason that Peter makes no mention of this, which would have been of such importance to him, is that the whole of the present narrative assumes that such a command could not have been given at that time.

**43.** *Whosoever believeth in him*: i.e. whether Jew or Gentile.

**44.** The miraculous descent of the spirit before the baptism is intended to make Peter still more certain that God wills the unconditional acceptance of the Gentiles. The mention of speaking with tongues (46) serves the same purpose, that being the surest proof of the presence of the spirit (comp. note on ii. 4).

**47.** *Water*: “the water.”

#### CHAPTER xi.

**3.** Eating with the Gentiles, according to xv. 20, 29; 1 Cor. viii.—x.; Gal. ii. 12, as well as this passage, was the very point which was practically raised in connection with the question of their acceptance (comp. note on x. 11 sqq.).

**4.** Here the preaching to the Gentiles rests only upon express command and a concurrence of various miracles. What a very different ground is taken by Paul, Rom. ix.—xi.

**12.** More stress is laid upon the presence of these companions here than in x. 23, because, as witnesses actually present, they give efficient security for the accuracy of his statements.

**13.** *An angel* should be “the angel.”

xi. 19—xii. 25.

The founding of the Gentile-Christian church in Antioch.  
Miraculous deliverance of Peter.

**19.** After all these preparations the writer really tells us of the origin of a Gentile-Christian community in Antioch, but he

gives no hint whether or in what manner this is connected with the divine direction to Peter, the history of which he has just related. The absolute freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law cannot in any case have been recognized there, inasmuch as Paul alone was the independent pioneer in this.—*Antioch*: the well-known imperial city on the river Orontes, in which there was the most extensive and thorough intercourse between the eastern and western nations.

22. On the position of Barnabas as a mediator, compare notes on iv. 36, ix. 27.

26. *And it came to pass*, &c., should be “But it came to pass that they were connected in the church for a whole year, and taught much people, and that in Antioch the disciples were first called Christians.”—The origin of the name *Christian*, which in any case is of Latin form and must have been invented by the Gentiles, is closely connected, in the opinion of our author, with the separation of the Christians from the synagogue and their appearance as an independent community. There are additional difficulties connected with the appearance of a name of Latin formation in the Greek city of Antioch.

27 sqq. The Book of Acts emphasizes the fact that the Gentile church which has just been founded remains in the closest connection with the mother church at Jerusalem. The immediate occasion of this was the famine which raged in Palestine and the surrounding countries in the reign of Claudius. The writer converts this into a universal famine extending over the whole world (comp. Josephus, xx. 2, 5). In consequence of a prophecy concerning it, Barnabas and Saul are sent to convey support to the communities in Judea. This journey of Saul, however, is unhistorical, for in Gal. i. ii., where he tells us of his first visit (Acts ix. 26 sqq.) and of his second (Acts xv. 2 sqq.), he could never have omitted to mention a third, if such had taken place, between these two. The writer seems to have introduced this narrative on the strength of some tradition corresponding with Paul’s last journey to Jerusalem which was connected with the bringing of a collection (1 Cor. xvi. 1—4), and to have derived his details from what was otherwise known about Paul. His great object was to represent the relation between Paul and the primitive community as being throughout an undisturbed relation of dependence.

## CHAPTER xii.

1. Before the gospel turns entirely to the Gentiles, the writer gives one more striking example of the unwillingness of the Israelites to receive it. Prince and people unite to prepare a persecution of the Christian community, to which an apostle falls a victim, and from which the chief apostle Peter is only rescued by a miracle. The writer dwells with delight upon the miraculous deliverance of Peter, thus taking leave as it were of the hero of the first part of his work, before turning his attention entirely to Paul.—*Herod*, surnamed Agrippa I., was the cunning but vacillating grandson of Herod the Great. After the varied fortunes of his earlier life, he was made king of the tetrarchy of Philip, together with the territory of Lysanias, by his friend the emperor Caius Caligula, on his accession in the year 37 A.D. He afterwards received in addition the territory of Antipas, and finally Judea and Samaria were added by the emperor Claudius. What is here narrated about him agrees with what we learn elsewhere of his attempt at an appearance of Jewish piety, and popularity with the Pharisee-ridden people, especially after the bitter oppression of the Jews by Caligula.

2. James the elder, the son of Zebedee, must be distinguished from James the younger, the son of Alphæus (i. 13), and also from the brother of the Lord (xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18).

4. *Four quaternions*: i.e. four companies of four soldiers each.

7. *The angel* should be “an angel.”—*Prison*: “chamber.”

9. This verse expresses the marvellous and mysterious impression that is made upon Peter by his liberation. It is no longer possible to come to any decision as to the historical value of the narrative, as we have no other sources of information.

12. *And when he had considered the thing*, should be “And when he had become aware of it.”

15. *His angel*: i.e. his guardian angel who had appeared instead of him or in his interest. The idea of the existence of personal guardian angels is found also in the words of Jesus in Matt. xviii. 10.

17. Peter’s commission and the place to which he went are left entirely undefined, and as the writer here takes leave altogether of the history of Peter, we can only suppose that he found

the further accounts of his career of no avail for his purpose. He deals in the same way with Paul (comp. note on xxviii. 31).

19. *That they should be put to death*: lit. “that they should be led away,” i.e. led away to execution.

20 sqq. The Book of Acts represents the solemn reception of the Phœnician embassy as the occasion of the occurrence here narrated. Josephus, on the other hand (Ant. xix. 8, 2), lays the scene in the theatre, where Herod was giving gladiatorial shows in honour of the emperor Claudius, and where the magnificence of his silver-broidered garments gleaming in the morning sun caused him to be saluted as a god. Soon after, Josephus tells us, Herod saw the owl which it had been foretold should be the messenger of death to him, was seized by a violent pain in the bowels and died after five days.—In the Book of Acts this whole story has no meaning, unless the writer regards the sudden and terrible death of Herod as a retribution for his crime against the Christians.

25. *Fulfilled their ministry*: i.e. delivered up the collection that had been made.

### xiii. xiv.

Paul's first missionary journey through Cyprus and Asia Minor.

### CHAPTER xiii.

1. All three of the apostle's journeys of which accounts are given in the Book of Acts, start from Antioch and end with a visit to Jerusalem. In the second and third narratives we find clear indications of their having been derived from some written source. In the first, however, this is not the case. Moreover, in the letters of the apostle himself we find no definite information about this first journey. Hence it is no longer possible for us to determine how far its descriptions are authentic. According to Gal. i. 21, ii. 1, the apostle remained for fourteen years in the regions of Syria and Cilicia. The Book of Acts therefore gives us in any case only a very small part of his labours during this long period. The writer must, however, have had at command some written sources or other for his account of the first journey.—*Which had been brought up with Herod*: i.e. his foster-brother.—Paul's independence in his apostolic labours, which as a matter of fact was so distinct and marked, is thrown as much as possible

into the shade in the Book of Acts, and perhaps that is the reason why he is here introduced last among the prophets and teachers. For the same reason he is represented as undertaking his journey only at the express command of God (ver. 2), and not then independently and of himself, but by commission of the community (ver. 3).

4. *Seleucia* is at the mouth of the river Orontes, on which Antioch itself stands.—According to iv. 36, Barnabas was a native of Cyprus. It was a senatorial province, and consequently received a new proconsul annually from the senate.

5. *John* is the John Mark of xii. 12.—[*To their minister* i.e. as their attendant or servant.]

[6, 8. *Sorcerer* should be “magian.” Comp. viii. 9, and see note on Matt. ii. 1.]

[7, 8, 12. *Deputy* should be “proconsul.”]

6. *Paphos* was equally famous for its oracle of Venus and notorious for the disorders connected with the prophecy sorcery and so forth that was practised there.

8. *Elymus*: i.e. “the sage,” an Arabic designation which the magian had probably given to himself.

9. From this narrative onwards, the Book of Acts always employs the name of Paul for Saul. It is probable that the apostle, in accordance with a custom of the Jews of frequent occurrence, had used both names side by side before his conversion, the one in his intercourse with Jews and the other with Gentiles. In any case the change which is made here is connected with the beginning of his mission to the Gentiles.

10 sqq. The writer here relates a victory on the part of Paul over a magian, entirely similar to that of Peter in viii. 18 sqq., and thus places the two upon the same footing of apostolic authority. In addition to this, however, he brings forward as prominently as possible at the very beginning of Paul’s mission, the contrast between the readiness of the Gentile official to receive the truth of the gospel, and the hostility which the Jewish magian manifests towards it (comp. vv. 6 sqq., 12).—We can scarcely decide what may be the historical germ of this narrative.

13. *Perga*: the capital of Pamphylia, on the river Cestrus.—The name of Barnabas, which has hitherto been placed before that of the apostle, is henceforth always placed second, except

in some special cases to which attention will be called (comp. ix. 27, xi. 25, xv. 25).—The ground on which John Mark here departed from Paul was probably an essential difference between their views as to the relation between Gentiles and Jews in Christianity (comp. xv. 38). The Book of Acts purposely passes rapidly over this dispute.

**14.** *Antioch in Pisidia* had been raised by Augustus to the rank of a Roman colony

**15.** *Ye men and brethren* should be “Brethren.”—This speech of Paul’s, which is regarded by the writer as the central point of the first journey (just as the speech at Athens to the Gentiles (xvii. 22—31) is regarded as the central point of the second journey, and the address to the Christians at Miletus (xx. 18—35) of the third), is represented as a discourse in the synagogue addressed only to Jews. Its contents correspond in a striking manner with the speech of Stephen, and with the peculiar views of the writer which find expression elsewhere. Comp., for example, vv. 17—22 with chap. vii., vv. 24—31 with x. 37 sqq., ver. 25 with Luke iii. 15 sq., ver. 31 with i. 3. The speech points out emphatically the blessings shown by God to the people of Israel in its history down to the time of Jesus (vv. 17—22) and through Jesus (23—31), which were rejected by Israel. Then follows an urgent exhortation to accept the gospel under a threat of divine judgment (vv. 32—41).

**16.** *Ye that fear God*: these are the proselytes of the gate.

**18.** *Suffered he their manners* should be “he nourished and cherished them.

**20.** The Book of Acts here adopts the chronology of Josephus (*Antiquities*, viii. 3, 1), departing from that of 1 Kings vi. 1, where the whole period from the exodus out of Egypt to the fourth year of Solomon is reckoned at 480 years.

**22.** *I have found, &c.*: loosely quoted from Ps. lxxxix. 20 and 1 Sam. xiii. 14.

**25.** *Fulfilled*: “was fulfilling.”

**26.** The thought here expressed recurs in almost every speech in the Book of Acts. The word *for* in ver. 27 is introduced to establish the original destination of the gospel for Israel upon the thought that, in spite of the rejection of Jesus personally by Jews, which might be pardoned in case of their subsequent con-

version, it must still be preached to them first. Comp. iii. 17 sqq.

**27** *Because they knew him not fulfilled them* should be “failed to recognize him, and fulfilled the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath-day.”

**29.** The burial of Jesus was the work of his friends, but the Book of Acts is here concerned only with the fulfilment of the prophecy, and hence it is taken as part and parcel of the crucifixion.

**31.** Comp. notes on i. 3, x. 41.

**33.** *Again* should be omitted.—*In the second psalm* should be “in the first psalm.” Our first psalm was often reckoned as an introduction to the whole collection, and then the enumeration began with Psalm ii.—The passage quoted here (Ps. ii. 7) is applied to the baptism, and only what follows to the resurrection.

**34.** Is. iv. 3.—On the inexact quoting of the Old Testament, see note on vii. 14.

**35.** Ps. xvi. 10.—There is a striking resemblance between this and ii. 27 Comp. note on ii. 25.

**36.** *After he had served his own generation, &c.* : “after he had served the will of God in his own time.”

**38.** *Men and brethren* should be “brethren.”

**38, 39.** This is the only passage in the Book of Acts in which the central point of Paul’s gospel appears, viz. the doctrine of justification by faith. And even here the words, *justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses*, express only a partial justification by faith, supplementing the righteousness which is of the law. And, again, this faith is not referred here (as it always is in Paul’s writings) to the death of Jesus.

**40.** Hab. i. 5. See note on vii. 14.

**42.** This verse should read, “And as they were going out, they begged that these words might be preached to them again the next Sabbath.”

**43.** *Persuaded* : “exhorted.”

**46.** *Waxed bold* : “spoke out plainly”—According to the statement of this verse it was the rejection of the gospel by the Jews that first justified Paul’s mission to the Gentiles (comp. xvii. 1 sq., xviii. 6, xxviii. 26 sqq.). This is consistent with the

leading idea of the Book of Acts (see pp. 260 sq.), but it is just as inconsistent with the apostle's principles as expressed in his letters, according to which he was conscious from the first of being called to be an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. i. 16, ii. 7 sq.), and could never have connected the free proclamation of the gospel to all the world, to which he felt himself bound, with the accidental circumstance of Jewish opposition (Rom. i. 14; Gal. iii. 28).

**47.** *Isaiah xlix. 6 sq.*

[**48.** *Ordained*: i.e. appointed.]

**50.** *Devout and honourable women*: i.e. proselytes to Judaism.

**51.** Comp. Matt. x. 14.—*Iconium* was the chief city of Lycaonia.

**52.** *The disciples*: i.e. in Antioch.

#### CHAPTER xiv.

**1.** *The Greeks* here are Greeks well disposed to the Jews. Comp. xiii. 16, 26, 43.

**6.** *Lystra and Derbe*: both south-east of Iconium.

**8** sqq. The healing of a lame man here effected by Paul corresponds in a remarkable manner with that effected by Peter (iii. 2 sqq.), almost to the very expressions used (comp. note on iii. 6 sqq.).

**11** sqq. While the Jews rejected the message of the apostles, the Gentiles received them as gods (comp. xxviii. 6). We can scarcely believe that such a deification of men could actually take place at that time, though it is not altogether impossible. In the connection in which it appears in the Book of Acts, however, it serves to bring vividly before the reader the extraordinary impression made by the act and person of Paul, and the religious receptivity of the Gentiles, and at the same time affords an occasion for the confession of the One God by Paul (vv. 15 sqq.). Comp. Rom. i. 19 sqq.; Acts xvii. 22 sqq.

**12.** *Because he was the chief speaker*: This remark is intended to prevent the reader from supposing that Barnabas, who since xiii. 13 retires behind Paul, had made the most powerful impression of the two.

[**13.** *Jupiter which was before their city*: i.e. “Jupiter whose temple was before the city gates.”]

**14.** *Ran in*: “leapt out.”

[15. *of like passions*: lit. suffering, or subject to, the same things, i.e. "of like nature."]

16. Comp. note on xvii. 24.

17. *Us our* should be "you your."

19. This is probably the stoning referred to by Paul in 2 Cor. xi. 25.

23. Election by the community is here excluded. According to the view taken in the Pauline Epistles, the choice of such officers did not rest upon any official authority of the apostles, but upon free self-determination, according to the gifts and capabilities of the individual (1 Cor. xvi. 15 sq., xii. 28).

25. *Attalia*: on the coast of Pamphylia.

27. The result of the first journey, which according to the view of the Book of Acts must receive confirmation from Jerusalem.

#### xv. 1—34.

The final determination of the relation between Jews and Gentiles in the church.

#### CHAPTER xv.

1 sqq. Occupying a significant position in the middle of the book, we here find the account of a solemn arrangement between the Gentile mission of Paul which was free from the law, and the Jewish-Christian school under the law, the representatives of which were found at Jerusalem, and a final confirmation of the apostolic labours of Paul by the assembled college of the first apostles and witnesses to the gospel, under distinct conditions imposed upon the Gentile-Christian communities. The fact which lies at the foundation of this narrative is the journey of Paul to Jerusalem, which he undertook with the object of coming to some arrangement, concerning his gospel, with those "who were of reputation" (Gal. ii. 1 sqq.). From the unquestionable account given by Paul in his Epistle, it is evident that our writer had here historical materials, but has altered them essentially in favour of his own views, and thus come into collision with the undoubted evidences of the apostolic age. Thus, according to Gal. ii. 2, Paul went up to Jerusalem in consequence of a spontaneous impulse of his own; while according to Acts xv. 2 sqq. he is commissioned by the church at Antioch. According to Gal. ii. 6 sqq., 11 sqq., he had to endure a serious

contest with the apostles in Jerusalem ; while in the Book of Acts no opposition appears between him and them, Peter and James speaking most zealously on behalf of Paul, and Paul himself merely narrating the results of his mission to the Gentiles (xv. 7—21). Again, according to Gal. ii. 5 sqq., Paul carries his gospel, which is free from the law, in opposition to the twelve, only undertaking a duty to the mother community in Jerusalem which is not inconsistent with it, and the mission field is divided between him and the twelve, so that he is henceforth to be regarded as an apostle to the Gentiles, and they as apostles to the Jews, not united with him therefore in his work ; while on the contrary the Paul of the Book of Acts suffers a portion of the Mosaic law to be imposed upon him as obligatory on the communities under his charge, and himself submits to it (xv. 20) ; indeed he even obtains a formal letter of recommendation from the twelve (vv. 23 sqq.). On the other hand, the obligation to assist the mother church (Gal. ii. 10) is not even mentioned, and there is not a word about the division of the mission field, for the simple reason that here (x.) Peter has already appeared as an apostle to the Gentiles, and Paul appears throughout as an apostle to the Jews. Further, the contest as to the circumcision of Titus, upon which, according to Gal. ii. 3 sqq., Paul lays the chief stress, is only referred to in very general terms in Acts. xv. 5 sqq. Finally, moreover, while the account given in Gal. ii. 11 sqq. of the renewal of the contest between Paul and Peter at Antioch shows that there must have been some previous approach on the part of Peter to the views of Paul, it also shows equally plainly that this was by no means the case on the part of James, and that even Peter can never have taken up the position attributed to him by the Book of Acts in the passage now under consideration. If he had done so, Paul must of necessity have appealed to the fact in Gal. ii. 14 sqq. If it is improbable that the whole account before us is due purely to the writer's imagination, we can only suppose that, in addition to the Pauline Epistles, he made use of later and altered traditions, and worked them up with his historical materials into a narrative having the object of concealing as far as possible the opposition between the Pauline and the legal gospel, which in his own times had ceased to exist, or appeared only in an altered form and was confined to a smaller sphere, and

also of representing the position of the church of his own day as the original position taken up by the apostles and recognized by them all without opposition. See p. 261.

**4.** The solemn reception marks the importance of the occasion and the business before them.

**5.** The question whether the Gentile Christians were under an obligation to adopt circumcision was the chief point in dispute in the apostolic times, and according to Gal. ii. 3 in this very discussion. The Book of Acts, however, never returns to it again at all, only touching upon it here and in verse 1, and the demand here expressed, in which, according to Gal. ii. 3, 6, the apostles also agreed, is here confined to a small circle of zealots.

**7** *And when there had been much disputing* should be “But when a great dispute arose.”—*A good while ago*: about fourteen years. The writer desires to bring forward as prominently as possible the original and undoubted destination of the gospel for the Gentiles.

**8.** Comp. x. 44 sqq., xi. 15 sqq.

**10, 11.** [*To put*: i.e. by putting].—Here Peter expresses the freedom of the Gentile Christians from the law more strongly than it is expressed anywhere else in the Book of Acts. He even relieves those who were formerly Jews from the servitude of the law, which everywhere else, even in the speech of James which follows (vv. 19 sqq.), they are assumed to be under. Comp. xviii. 18, xxi. 26.

**12.** According to 1 Cor. i. 22, it was distinctly not upon signs and wonders, but upon the necessity of his own inner consciousness, that Paul based his gospel.

**14.** *Did visit the Gentiles, &c.*, should be “determined to take out from the Gentiles a people for his name.”

**16.** Amos ix. 11, quoted with some freedom from the Greek version.

**17, 18.** *Who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world,* should be “who doeth all this, which is known from old time.”—The words “which is known from old time” are an addition of the speaker for the purpose of marking the prophecy

**19.** *My sentence* should be “my opinion.”—*Are turned*: “turn.”—When we consider how frequently and how distinctly the

apostle Paul expresses his principle of the justification of man by faith alone (Gal. ii. 18 sq., 1 Cor. i. 23), it is impossible to suppose that he ever accepted the four provisions of the law which are here resolved upon, and according to ver. 22 approved by the whole assembly and prescribed to the Gentile-Christian communities. On the other hand, they are not the invention of the writer of the Book of Acts, but their validity and recognition in the post-apostolic, and to some extent in the apostolic age may be proved (for example, from Rev. ii. 14, 20). Still in the apostolic age they can only have been valid in communities which were not under the exclusive influence of Paul. They represent the smallest amount of legal conditions which, from the legal standpoint, could be demanded from those who were formerly Gentiles, being such as were demanded by Judaism from those who were known as the proselytes of the gate. The writer has removed to the apostolic age, and founded upon the decree here given, those conditions which in his own time were universally accepted, and by means of which the association in Christianity of those who had formerly been Jews and those who had formerly been Gentiles had been rendered possible. Possibly in so doing he only followed a tradition which already lay before him. As time went on, the provisions which, according to xvi. 4, xxi. 25, were determined upon for ever, fell out of use in the Latin churches.

**20.** *From pollutions of idols*: i.e. from taking part in Gentile sacrificial feasts, and eating the flesh from idolatrous sacrifices which was sold in the markets. Even the latter was regarded, according to 1 Cor. viii.—x., Rev. ii. 14, 20, and other evidence, by those who had formerly been Jews as most scandalous. Paul's opinion is different.—*Fornication*: i.e. not simply every kind of unchastity, the prohibition of which in Christianity is understood, but also marriage within those degrees of relationship within which it was allowed by the Gentiles but forbidden in the Old Testament, and also forbidden forms of marriage and other forbidden lusts.—*Things strangled*: flesh of animals from which the blood had not been taken, for, according to the Old Testament view, the soul dwells in the blood (Lev. xvii. 13, 14). Hence the consumption of the blood of beasts at Gentile sacrificial feasts and on other occasions was an abomination to the Israelites.

**21.** This universal spread of Judaism with its ancient laws which were thus universally known among the Gentiles, is intended to justify the demands made upon them in regard to the law in ver. 20.

**22.** *Silas* is short for Silvanus. The person here spoken of is the Silas who afterwards appears so frequently in the Book of Acts, and is also mentioned in 2 Cor. i. 19, 1 Thess. i. 1.

**23.** *Syria and Cilicia*: From this it is evident that the dispute must have extended over a larger area than we might have supposed from what is said in xv. 1.

**24.** *Hare troubled you, &c.*, should be “have troubled you with words, disturbing your souls, to whom we gave no commandment.” The intervening words are an interpolation.

**25, 26.** Barnabas here, as in ver. 12, is placed before Paul in consequence of the part he plays as a mediator. Comp. note on xiii. 13. The recommendation and justification of Paul contained in these verses [where the *men that have hazarded their lives* are Barnabas and Paul, not the “chosen men” of the preceding verse] can only be intended to conceal as far as possible the deep gulf which in the apostolic times separated him from the Jewish Christians. It cannot be reconciled with Gal. ii. 6.

**27.** Judas and Silas, as two new-comers enjoying the full confidence of the apostles, confirm the testimony in favour of Paul and Barnabas by which their proceedings are justified.

**34.** This verse should be omitted.

#### xv. 35—xviii. 22.

Paul’s second journey. Introduction of the gospel into Europe.

**35.** *Paul also*: “But Paul.”

**36.** See note on xiii. 1.

**37.** [*Determined* should be “wished”].—According to the account here given of this dispute, it was merely a personal matter, not a question of principle. Probably, however, we ought to infer the very opposite from xiii. 13 (comp. note on that passage). More important, however, is the fact that, instead of being directed to the second dispute between Peter and Paul at Antioch, described in Gal. ii. 11 sqq., which ought properly to have been introduced here, the attention of the reader is called to a different matter, and, according to the representation here given, a matter of no importance in connection with this dispute.

**39.** *And the contention was so sharp between them, that: lit.*  
 “And there arose exasperation, so that.”

### CHAPTER XVI.

**2 sq.** According to Gal. ii. 3 sqq., Paul distinctly refused to circumcise another companion, Titus, at the demand of the community in Jerusalem; and according to Gal. ii. 18, v. 2 sqq., though he considered circumcision as in itself a matter of indifference, he declares that the voluntary submission to the rite on the part of a Christian is equivalent to a renunciation of the freedom won through Christ, and of salvation. According to this, there could be no reasons which should induce him to act in contradiction to this principle and so to the very foundation of his gospel in the case now before us. Regard for the Jews, especially, explains nothing, as Paul distinctly refuses to be influenced by it on other occasions, and such consideration for them as would compel him to renounce his gospel is quite inconsistent with his character. Hence this statement that he circumcised Timothy can only rest on some erroneous account which the writer of the Book of Acts has introduced (perhaps on the authority of some later tradition, but inconsistent with the resolution of xv. 24 sqq.) in order to show, in opposition to the well-known case of Titus, Gal. ii. 3 sqq., the apostle’s readiness to accommodate himself to the requirements of the law. The events narrated in xviii. 18, xxi. 26, must be regarded in the same way.

**4.** See note on xv. 19 sqq.

**6.** *And were forbidden* should be “having been forbidden.”—In this and the following verses the writer passes quickly over the labours of Paul in Asia Minor, partly in order that he may the sooner reach the most important point in the second journey, viz. the passage into Europe, and partly that he may avoid the important foundation of the Galatian communities with which were connected those contests between Paul and the original community at Jerusalem which were most inconsistent with the writer’s own views.—*Asia* see note on ii. 9.—*Galatia*: The preceding verses, 1—6, show us that this does not mean the Roman province of Galatia, which included Pisidia and parts of Pamphylia and Lycaonia, from which Paul had just come, but the district of Galatia on the two sides of the river Halys. In

this district Paul now preached his gospel, and to the communities established here, not to those of the whole province including those which he had founded on his first journey, he addressed his Epistle to the Galatians while on his third journey, in order to keep them from falling away to the Jewish-Christian gospel under the law. Comp. note on xviii. 23. The Book of Acts, by means of the double indication given to Paul by the Holy Spirit (vv. 6, 7), directs our attention to the passage into Europe (vv. 9 sqq.). The historical germ of this story of the Holy Spirit directing that the gospel was not to be preached here, appears to have been a severe attack of physical suffering under which the apostle at that time laboured. Comp. Gal. iv. 13.

**7.** *The Spirit* should be “the spirit of Jesus.”

**8.** *Troas*: a city on the shore of the Hellespont.

**10.** The change to the first person, “we endeavoured,” &c., is not due to the arrival of a new travelling companion, but to the reasons given on pp. 264 sqq. The writer of the Book of Acts, who must be clearly distinguished from the writer of the journal itself, purposely introduces at this most important point of his narrative the very words of his authority.

**11.** *Samothracia*: an island in the Ægean Sea.—*Neapolis*: a sea-port in Thrace.

**12.** *Philippi*: In the most important city of Macedonia, Paul founded the first Christian community in Europe. The extant Epistle to the Philippians, written during his imprisonment in Rome, gives pleasing testimony to their faithful adherence to him.—*The chief city of that part of Macedonia* should be “the most important city in the province.”

**16.** *A spirit of divination*: What is meant is a miraculous possession by an evil spirit which prophesied from her in the voice of a ventriloquist.

**18.** *Being grieved* should be “being annoyed.”

**19.** Here the writer ceases to employ the words of his authority, and probably at the same time departs from the more exact account itself.

**20.** *The magistrates* are the two chief magistrates of a Roman colony. It has already been stated in ver. 12 that Philippi was such a colony.

**26.** Any attempt at a natural explanation of this story would

only show a want of appreciation of the story and of respect for the text. The writer intends to give an account of a miracle, and he also evidently connects it with the prayer in ver. 25. The narrative has a remarkable resemblance to that of the deliverance of the apostles in Jerusalem, v. 18 sqq. In each case the release from prison is not the direct aim of the miracle, which is rather to give a miraculous proof of the divine power and of the divine pleasure in the apostles. It is for this reason that Paul and Silas do not appeal to their Roman citizenship before this occurrence (ver. 22), but only after it; otherwise the miracle could not have been introduced. According to 1 Thess. ii. 2 (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 25), Paul suffered severe ill-treatment in Philippi, but he says nothing about any miraculous divine testimony on his behalf, and as we have no sign here of any account from an eye-witness, it is impossible any longer to determine what fact may have lain at the foundation of our narrative.

**34.** *Meat*: lit. “a table.”—*And rejoiced, &c.*: “And rejoiced with all his house that he had come to believe in God.”

**35.** The absence of any sufficient ground for this change of purpose on the part of the magistrates makes the whole account most confused.

**37.** The Valerian law gave to Roman citizens the privilege of total exemption from scourging. Paul’s Roman citizenship is only known from the Book of Acts, that of Silas only from this single passage.—We can only explain the silence of Paul and Silas, when scourged, on the grounds stated in the note on ver. 26. And only by the attempt of the Book of Acts to recommend the gospel to the civil authorities can we explain their demand for satisfaction at the hands of the magistrates, and the conduct of the latter in vv. 38 sq., when as a matter of fact they were quite innocent.

#### CHAPTER xvii.

**1.** *Amphipolis and Apollonia*: important cities in Macedonia. *Thessalonica*: a flourishing and wealthy commercial city at the head of the Thermaic gulf, having a large number of Jewish inhabitants, and the seat of a Roman *praetor*. Here Paul founded a large community, to which he wrote from Corinth the Epistle known as the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (comp. note on xviii. 11).

**2.** See note on xiii. 46.

**3.** *Christ must needs have suffered and risen*: “it behoved Christ to suffer and rise.”

**4.** *Believed*: “took part with him” [strictly “were persuaded”]. The narrative which follows here serves again to set forth the contrast between the readiness of the Gentiles to receive the gospel, and the obstinate resistance of the Jews (comp. note on xiii. 10 sq.). At the same time it contains a political justification of the gospel against the Jewish libel that it was dangerous to the state (vv. 6 sq.; comp. note on xviii. 13).

**5.** This verse should read, “But the Jews were zealous, and collected certain evil men from the rabble and raised a mob,” &c.

**9.** *Security*: evidently only for the political innocence of the apostles which is thereby established.

**10.** *Berea*: situated in another part of Macedonia east of Thessalonica.

**11.** *More noble than those in Thessalonica*: To this more favourable opinion of the Jews is immediately opposed reprehensible conduct on their part in ver. 13.

**12.** *Honourable women*: see note on xiii. 50.

**14.** *As it were to*: “as far as.”

**15.** According to 1 Thess. iii. 1 sq., Timothy, in accordance with this command, met the apostle in Athens, and from there was sent by him back to Thessalonica; while, according to Acts xviii. 5, he did not meet him until he reached Corinth.

**17** Even in the thoroughly pagan city of Athens Paul first visits the synagogue. Comp. note on xiii. 46.

**19.** *Arcopagus*: It is probably of distinct purpose that the writer describes the Apostle to the Gentiles as brought before this supreme court of Greece, that he may thereby afford him a suitable theatre for the delivery of the great defence of Christianity against heathenism which he here puts in his mouth. According to his representation, this address to the Gentiles forms the central point of the second journey (comp. note on xiii. 15). But while the two apologies against Judaism, the one in the mouth of Stephen before the high council, the other in the mouth of the apostle Paul in the Pisidian city of Antioch, turn into bitter complaints against the Jews and end with threats, the speech before us, in accordance with the fundamental ideas

of the writer, dwells especially upon the near approach of pagan piety (ver. 23) and the pagan idea of God (vv. 27 sq.) to Christianity, speaks of the ground of pagan errors as simply ignorance which God has overlooked, and brings forward no complaints or accusations (ver. 30).

**20.** *Strange* should be “foreign.”

**22.** *Mars' hill* should be “Areopagus.”—*Too superstitious* should be “very god-fearing.” The word purposely leaves it doubtful whether the fear was a true and spiritually healthy fear or superstitious.

**23.** *For as I passed by, &c.,* should be “For as I passed through and looked at your sanctuaries.”—*Whom him* should be “what that.”—According to other accounts also, there were several altars in Athens such as that which the apostle here speaks of. They were erected on occasions on which it was not known to which god to turn. It is probably from want of accuracy that the inscription known to us from other sources, “to the unknown gods,” is here put in the singular, in accordance with the general purpose of the speech.

**24** sqq. The unity and supermundane nature of God, the unworthiness of the heathen worship and the unity of the whole race of men formed in the image of God, are the fundamental ideas of the Christian apologetic literature of the second century. The gospel of Paul, on the other hand, opposes to heathenism first of all the holiness of God and the want of all righteousness in the natural man before him. Rom. i. 18 sqq.

**28.** *Certain also of your own poets:* viz. Aratus of Cilicia and Cleanthes of Lycia. In the passage quoted they refer to Zeus.

**30.** *God winked at* should be “God overlooked.” We have already had a similar view expressed in xiv. 16. The historical Paul, on the other hand, teaches that there is a divine judgment upon the Gentiles (Rom. i. 18 sq.); and further, there is no reference here to the central point of the Pauline gospel, the redeeming death of Christ. Compare with this Paul's own teaching, e.g. in Rom. iii. 19—26.

**31.** The unexpected introduction of the resurrection and the sudden and abrupt termination of the speech are alike remarkable, and tend to confirm the opinion expressed above that the writer had no authority before him for this speech. See also pp. 264

sqq.—*By that man whom he hath ordained*, &c., should be “By a man whom he hath appointed, providing [more exactly, ‘having provided’] faith for all by having raised him from the dead.”

**34.** The account of the formation of a small community in Athens, with the mention of the names of two persons with regard to whom we have no other historical information, compels us to suppose that the writer must have had some distinct tradition before him.

#### CHAPTER xviii.

**1.** In Corinth, according to the evidence of his two extant Epistles to the Corinthians, Paul founded a very large community, in which the gospel gave rise to the richest and most varied spiritual life, and with which he kept up an unbroken and most lively intercourse until the time of his imprisonment. In spite of this, the writer of the Book of Acts only speaks cursorily of it, and barely mentions the apostle’s second residence in Corinth (see xx. 2). There can scarcely be any other ground for this than his fear of recalling to memory the violent and fundamental disputes with this community which the apostle had to sustain.

**2.** *Aquila*: According to ver. 26, Aquila and his wife had already been converted to the gospel, and this statement is confirmed by 1 Cor. xvi. 19. As the writer gives no express account of the conversion, he would seem to assume that it had already taken place in Rome, where Paul also assumed the existence of a large Christian community when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans in the winter of 58-59, A.D.—This edict of the emperor Claudius against the Jews is known to us from several pagan writers. The execution of it at any rate cannot have been very strict and have lasted very long, as it is assumed in xxviii. 17 sqq. that there was a considerable Jewish population in Rome, and, according to Rom. xvi. 3, we find Aquila and Priscilla again in Rome in the year 58 A.D.

**5.** *Was pressed in the spirit and testified* should be “was zealously engaged in teaching, testifying.”

**6.** Here again the apostle’s preaching to the Gentiles is represented as being due to the refusal of the Jews to hear him. See notes on xiii. 46 sqq., xxviii. 17 sqq.

**11.** *A year and six months*: This embraces the whole period of his stay at Corinth, including, therefore, what is mentioned in

ver. 18. The writer purposely describes only one event out of this long period of the apostle's most fruitful labours, and he selects one that serves to support his fundamental view of the relation of the Jews and Gentiles to the gospel (comp. note on ver. 1).—It was during this residence in Corinth that the (“first”) Epistle to the community at Thessalonica was probably written. Paul while at Athens had already heard from Timothy how they fared (1 Thess. iii. 1, 2).

**12.** *Gallio*: brother of Seneca, well-known Roman philosopher.—[*Deputy*: properly “proconsul.”]

**13.** *Contrary to the law*: According to what follows, this means the Mosaic law, but then it is impossible to understand how the charge could be brought before a Gentile court.

**14.** *Lewdness*: “roguey.”

**15.** *Read*: “But if it be a dispute concerning doctrine and names and your own law, look to it yourselves.”—This decision of Gallio's corresponds entirely with the fundamental view of the book; the writer delights to adduce here the words of a Roman statesman which openly and solemnly testify that the Roman state perceives no danger to itself from the gospel.

**17.** *All the Greeks* should be “they all.” It refers, however, to the Greeks and not to the Jews.—*Sosthenes* was probably one of Paul's chief accusers. Gallio's indifference to the attack upon him reflects the writer's hostility to the Jews.

**18.** *Having shorn his head*: Though this may refer either to Paul or Aquila, in either case it is intended to show Paul's zeal for the Jewish law (comp. notes on xvi. 2, xxi. 24). Vv. 21 sq. also serve the same purpose; and the circumstance that nothing more is said as to the reason for the vow which was discharged by this shaving of the hair, necessarily leads us to suppose that what is meant is actually a Jewish Nazirite's vow or something of that kind.—*Cenchrea* is the harbour of Corinth east of the city.

**21.** *I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem*: These words are wanting in a considerable number of the MSS., but, apart from other reasons for regarding them as authentic, they suit the connection in which they appear, and are in agreement with the views of the writer. They are moreover assumed in what follows.

**22.** *Cæsarea*: This Cæsarea is the Palestinian sea-port on the

Mediterranean between Joppa and Dora (see viii. 40).—*Gone up*: i.e. to Jerusalem. This journey is not mentioned in Gal. ii., and hence we must probably come to the same conclusion about it as about the one in Acts xi. 30.

xviii. 23—xxi. 14.

Paul's third missionary journey. His labours in Ephesus. Conclusion of this stage of his career.

**23.** The earlier and middle parts of the third missionary journey which begins here, with the exception of the stay at Ephesus, are only cursorily described, and a number of the districts which Paul had formerly visited are not mentioned. On the writer's plan, see notes on xiii. 1, 15, xvii. 19.—*The country of Galatia*, here as in xvi. 6 (see note), is the district, not the province. The writer purposely avoids mentioning the great contest with the gospel under the law which the apostle had to sustain at this very time, in order that he might preserve from complete apostasy and submission to it the communities in Galatia which he had found when he visited them already alienated from his gospel free from the law, and which after his departure had attached themselves still more definitely to Jewish Christianity in consequence of the influence of emissaries from Jerusalem.

**24** sqq. In the section which here follows, the writer describes, for the first and only time, labours of Paul which lasted for a considerable period in one of the most important communities, and in this respect he also places Paul upon an exact equality with Peter as a chief apostle. Hence it is intimated that Apollos, the teacher whom we read of in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, occupies a very inferior position to that of the apostle, as only proclaiming salvation to the Jews and (like the deacon Philip in contrast to Peter, viii. 4 sqq.) not possessing the gift of the holy spirit (vv. 24—28). The same purpose is served by the narrative of the disciples of John, who do not receive the holy spirit until Paul lays his hands upon them (xix. 1—7), and by the miraculous action of Paul (xix. 11—20). Finally, in Ephesus also, at the close of his labours, as described in the Book of Acts, Paul must again among the Gentiles be justified in turning to the conversion of the Gentiles by the refusal of the Jews to hear him (xix. 8—10). On the other hand, after a great victory over the idolatry of the Gentiles, he receives the most favourable

judgment from the Gentile authorities, and indeed an express declaration of his innocence of those charges which were being spread abroad concerning him by the Jews.

**25.** There can be no doubt that Apollos is here regarded as a Christian, and that the writer only intends to describe the lower stage of his preaching of the gospel in comparison with that of the apostle. For the same reason his preaching is described (ver. 28) as only hanging on the Old Testament and addressed to Jews. These accounts can scarcely be reconciled, indeed, with the certain testimony of the apostle himself, who places Apollos upon an equality with himself, and represents him as his immediate successor in his preaching to the Gentiles (1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 6, &c.).

**26.** *More perfectly* should be “more exactly”

#### CHAPTER xix.

**1.** *The upper coasts* should be “the upper country,” i.e. the inland districts of Asia Minor as distinguished from the coast.—*Disciples*: The writer does not, as might be supposed, mean disciples of John, but Christians, who however were only acquainted with the Johannine and not with the Christian baptism, and hence occupied the same inferior position as Apollos in xviii. 25. But when we find them proceeding to acknowledge that they have not so much as heard whether there be any holy spirit, we have no other indication of any disciples occupying such a position as that in the apostolic age, and indeed it is difficult to understand the possibility of it. This, however, only makes it more evident that it is the intention of the writer to assign to Paul, in a case in regard to which there can be no doubt, the apostolic privilege of imparting the spirit. The speaking with tongues and prophesying which follows in ver. 6 is the actual voucher for it.

**4.** *Christ Jesus* should be “Jesus.”

**9.** *That way*: “the way.”—*The school of one Tyrannus* should be “the school of Tyrannus.” This may have been simply the name of the place where they met, but any how the context shows that he was a Gentile.

**10.** This statement that Paul laboured for two years in the province of Asia, introduces the close of the narrative of his missionary labours among the Gentiles in the Book of Acts. It pro-

bably means that the general communication between the capital of Ephesus and the rest of Asia Minor caused his work practically to extend through the province, for there is no indication here of Paul's having undertaken any journeys from Ephesus, nor is there any trace elsewhere of his having done so.

12. Comp. v. 15. The writer accepts as a fact the transference of the apostle's miraculous powers to his clothes, and in so doing shows that he stands at a very considerable distance from the apostolic age.

13. *Vagabond*: “strolling.”

14. It is impossible to say exactly in what sense Sceva is called *chief of the priests*, or why seven sons are mentioned, while it appears from verse 16 that only two were engaged in the affair here described.

16. *Overcame them* should be “overcame both of them.”

19. *Curious arts* should be “unprofitable things,” i.e. sorcery and incantations, the forms of which were kept in books of magic. 50,000 drachmæ = £2000. This account of the valuation of the books, a thing altogether improbable in itself, to say nothing of the greatness of the amount, is a clear indication of the mythical nature of the authorities which the writer here makes use of.

21. Here, as in xx. 1, 3, 16, in accordance with the plan of the book, Paul's last journey to Macedonia and Greece appears only as being made en route for Jerusalem. Further, the real motive for this journey to Jerusalem, viz. to bring the great collection which had been made (1 Cor. xvi. 3), is omitted, and indeed, according to xx. 16, here again the intention of keeping a Jewish festival is adduced as his motive. The writer begins even here to prepare for the journey to Rome, of which he gives so full an explanation and description in the last chapters of his work.

23 sqq. According to 1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 9, 2 Cor. i. 8—10, Paul had considerable opposition to contend with in Ephesus, and passed through many dangers, so that even his life was in jeopardy; but in these passages there is no indication of the great victory over paganism described here. Hence, although it is highly probable that there is some foundation in fact for the present account, we have no proof at all of the accuracy of its details.

**24.** *Shrines*: i.e. small models of the famous temple of Diana at Ephesus.

**25.** *Craft* should be “gain.” [The word is the same that is rendered “gain” in ver. 24.]

**27.** *So that not only*, &c., should be “And not only is there danger of this business of ours being destroyed.”

**31.** *Chief* should be “chiefs:” Chiefs of Asia, or Asiarchs, was the name given to the presidents annually elected by the privileged cities of the province of Asia to preside over the public games in honour of the gods and the emperor.

**33 sq.** This sudden introduction of Alexander into the narrative without any explanation is probably due to the writer’s having made use of some source of information the remaining statements of which he does not give us. In any case, Alexander must be regarded as a Jew, not as a Jewish Christian, and this is sufficient for the writer, who only wants to show that here, as in Corinth (xviii. 17), the wrath of the Gentiles turned from the Christians against a Jew. Judaism appears here as the common enemy of Christianity and the Gentile state. We must not suppose that this is the Alexander of 2 Tim. iv. 14.

**35—40.** This speech declares publicly and solemnly that Christianity is not dangerous to the state, and even proceeds, perhaps with reference to the charges brought against Paul by the Jews and Jewish Christians (xviii. 13, xxi. 28), to absolve the Christians from the charge of blasphemy against idols.

**35.** *Worshipper*: “guardian.”—*From Jupiter* should be “from heaven.”

**38.** *The law is open*: “the courts are being held.” [*Deputies*: “proconsuls.”]

**39.** *Enquire* should be “seek.”

**40.** *There being no cause*, &c., should be “there being no culprit to bring forward, so that we might be in a position to give an account of this tumult.”

#### CHAPTER XX.

1 sqq. The writer only gives here a short survey of the apostle’s last journey, being indeed concerned only with the return and the journey to Jerusalem (see xix. 21). The account of this commences in ver. 4, where the journal begins again (xx. 5—15, xxi. 1—18). Verse 3 is intended to explain why this plan was

delayed by the pursuit of so circuitous a route. It is probably not without reason that Paul's residence in Corinth during the winter of 58-59 is not so much as mentioned here. It was connected with his severest contests with the Jewish Christianity of the law, which had already necessitated the two extant Epistles of the apostle to the community at Corinth, as well as two that have been lost; and it was at this time that he wrote the Epistle which set forth most decisively and most fully his own peculiar gospel free from the law, viz. the Epistle to the Christian community in Rome.

**4.** *Into Asia* should be omitted.—*Sopater* should be “Sopater, son of Pyrrhus.”—*Gaius of Derbe*: to be distinguished from the Gaius of Macedonia mentioned in xix. 29.

**5.** *These* may be most naturally understood to mean all the companions of Paul who have been mentioned. We must then, however, conclude that none of them (Timothy included) can have been the writer of the “journal.” (See pp. 264 sqq.)

**7** sqq. *The disciples* (ver. 7) and *they* (ver. 8) should be “we.”—As Peter is said to have raised the dead (ix. 36 sqq.), so also is Paul here. There is no doubt that this is what the writer means, for he says in ver. 9, “he was taken up dead,” and besides, he could have no other reason for describing what was otherwise an unimportant accident (see note on ver. 10). At the same time, the whole description of the scene is so vivid and so consistent, contrasting in this with many other miraculous narratives of the Book of Acts, that we may with great probability regard it as taken from the original narrative of Paul's companion, and, apart from the writer's view of the matter, there is nothing we need doubt in the story.

**10.** *His life is in him*: It appears from the context that what is meant by this is that this has been effected by Paul.

**13.** *Assos*: a sea-port of Mysia south of Troas.

**14.** *Mitylene*: capital of the island of Lesbos.

**15.** *Over against Chios*: i.e. off Chios. *Chios* and *Samos* are islands in the Ægean Sea. *Trogylgium* is the name of a city and promontory on the coast of Ionia.

**16—38.** This section bears the marks of being an insertion of the writer into the original narrative before him. Its object is to introduce an address to the presbyters of Ephesus, the contents

of which are of the greatest importance to the writer (comp. notes on xiii. 15, xvii. 19). The address itself, no less than the rest of the section, is most closely connected with the departure of the apostle from the communities which he had founded, and foretells (vv. 23—25, 29, 38) his end with a precision which can hardly be reconciled with passages in his contemporary or even later Epistles, e.g. Rom. xv. 22 sqq., Phil. ii. 24, Philem. 22. It is, moreover, very remarkable for its defence of Paul against charges which in the Book of Acts are never brought against him from any quarter (especially in vv. 20, 27, 34 sqq.), and finally for the view which it takes of the presbyters and bishops as responsible guides and leaders of the community standing over the laity and appointed by God himself (vv. 28 sq., 31 sq.), a view which is quite alien to those of the apostle found elsewhere. All these things show that the address itself is the writer's own composition. Such a justification of the apostle, and the importance here attached to his personality and his martyr's death, agree very well with the general plan of the writer, and it is only from his later position that we can explain the fundamental distinction here made between the priests and the laity.—It is remarkable that Paul devotes no time to the important community at Ephesus, while he spends seven days at Troas (ver. 6; comp. also note on xix. 21).

**18.** *From the first day that I came into Asia*: see xviii. 19. What is meant is proconsular Asia, with Ephesus as its capital; and, according to the Book of Acts, Paul had, since the time of entering it, only left Ephesus once for a short time (xviii. 22—xix. 1).

**22.** *Bound in the spirit*: In these words the apostle is represented as himself declaring the necessity of a martyr's death.

**23.** *The Holy Ghost*: i.e. Christian prophets whose utterances the writer afterwards reports, xxi. 4, 10 sqq.

**24.** *But none of those things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself*, should be “But for myself, I esteem my life of no value.”

**28.** [Over the which: strictly “in which.”] *Of God* should be “of the Lord.”—The elders here appear to be responsible for the salvation of the church.

**29.** There is no trace whatever in Paul's authentic Epistles of

the heretics so distinctly indicated here, nor of any fear of their appearance. Hence this passage can only be regarded as the writer's warning against the teachers of Gnostic errors in the second century thrown into the form of apostolic prophecy, and it can only be explained on this supposition.

**35.** *I have shewed you all things, &c.*, should be “I have shewed you that one ought to work, to help the weak and to remember,” &c.—Paul in his Epistles often assures us that he is working disinterestedly for the good of the community (e.g. 1 Cor. iv. 12, ix. 4 sqq.), but he never demands, as here, that the ministers and preachers of the gospel in general should all refuse to be supported by the community, just as he had done personally (see 1 Cor. ix. 7—14; Gal. vi. 6). The thought here expressed serves as a defence of the apostle against the well-known accusations of his opponents.—*It is more blessed to give than to receive*: a saying of Jesus not contained in our Gospels.

#### CHAPTER xxi.

**1.** Continuation of the narrative of Paul's companion, after the insertion [xx. 16—38].—*Cos* [A.V. Coos] and *Rhodes* are islands off the south-west coast of Asia Minor.—*Patara*: a sea-port over against Rhodes.

**3.** *Was to unlade* should be “discharged.”

**4.** *And finding disciples* should be “and having found the disciples :” i.e. the disciples who were there.—At every step the writer interweaves in his narrative prophecies and forebodings of the catastrophe in Jerusalem.

**7.** *And when we, &c.* : “But we finished our voyage from Tyre and came to Ptolemais.”—*Ptolemais*: a sea-port inhabited by Gentiles north of Mount Carmel, now known as Acca or St. Jean d'Acre. For some unknown reason the journey from this place to Cæsarea is made by land.

**8.** *That were of Paul's company* should be omitted.—*Philip*: see vi. 5, viii. 5 sqq.—There is other ecclesiastical tradition of the prophesying daughters of Philip. The writer seems to have introduced this passage from the record of Paul's companion, in order to bring in the prophecy concerning the lot that awaited the apostle (see note on ver. 4).

**10.** *Agabus* appears also in xi. 27 sq. as coming down from

Judea, and his prophecy of a famine gives rise to Paul's journey to Jerusalem. It is doubtless intended that Paul's present resistance to the very same prophet shall set his firmness and readiness for a martyr's death the more vividly before us, and verse 13 may then very well be put down to the writer, especially as ver. 14 follows very well upon ver. 12.

11. *The Jews*: According to ver. 32, it is not the Jews, but a Roman officer who seizes Paul. But after all he only does so in order to rescue him from the Jews, who appear in the Book of Acts as the proper enemies of Paul and the responsible cause of his fate. For this very reason, considering the connection in which we find it, there is nothing remarkable in the fact that Paul expects to die in the prophet-slaying capital of his enemies. Comp. note on xx. 16 sqq.

xxi. 15—xxvi. 32.

Arrest and trial of Paul.

15. *Took up our carriages* should be “equipped ourselves.”—The section which here follows, with the exception of vv. 15—18, does not belong to the journal. The writer has dealt very freely with his historical material, and transformed it into a defence of Paul against the accusations of the Jews and Jewish Christians. This is apparent especially in the circumstance that here again the Jews alone appear as the true enemies of Paul, compelling his arrest (xxi. 27 sqq.), his removal to Cæsarea (xxiii. 12 sqq., 23), and his appeal to the emperor (xxv. 3, 8, 10 sq.), and steadily seeking his death (xxi. 22 sqq.); while Paul as before receives protection from the Roman officials, and every kind of respect as a Roman citizen (xxi. 32, xxii. 24 sqq., xxiii. 10, 23 sqq., 27, 31 sqq., 34 sqq., xxiv. 23, xxv. 1 sq., 16). In the next place, the apostle himself, in spite of this hostility of the Jewish people, occupies doctrinally a position of entire conformity to the Jewish law (xxi. 24 sqq., xxiii. 3, 5, xxiv. 17), and in his defence is most jealously careful to prove his Jewish orthodoxy (xxii. 3 sqq., 17, xxiv. 11 sqq., 17, xxvi. 2 sqq., 22). This, however, brings the Book of Acts into collision, not only with the historical Paul's gospel free from the law, but also with itself; for if Paul really preached a gospel according to the law, the prejudice and hatred of the Jewish Christians against him, of which the Book of Acts itself speaks (xxi. 21 sqq.), must appear altogether incomprehensible.

sible. Equally unintelligible on that supposition are the accusations made by the Jews, his being kept in custody by Romans in Cæsarea and Rome, and, finally, the complete want of any sign of sympathy with the lot of the apostle on the part of the Christians in Jerusalem. In the third place, while the accusations of the Jews are purely imaginary, the point upon which Paul actually defends himself (viz. the proclamation of the gospel among the Gentiles, xxii. 21) never appears as one of their charges against him. All this has rendered the description of the trial, notwithstanding the historical foundation on which it rests, contradictory and confused; and, in particular, the three speeches of Paul in his own defence (xxii. 1 sqq., xxiv. 10 sqq., xxvi. 1 sqq.) give us scarcely anything more than the old sketch of the apostle's life, and his gospel stripped of all its individuality.

16. *And brought with them one Mnason*: “and brought us to one Mnason.”

17. *The brethren*: i.e. the whole Christian community at Jerusalem. The special interview with the leaders for a definite purpose then follows in ver. 18. This verse, which belongs to the journal, shows us that there must have been some mention there of a meeting with James.

20. *How many thousands*: strictly “how many myriads.” Probably this is intended to include Jews beyond the limits of Jerusalem and Palestine.

22. This verse should read, “How then? They will certainly hear that thou art come?”

23. *A vow*: i.e. a nazirite's vow (see note on xviii. 18). The apostle is to avail himself of this opportunity to prove to the Jewish Christians his zeal for the law. It is quite certain that the historical Paul could not have consented to this.

24. *And purify, &c.*, should be “and sanctify thyself with them and pay the charges for them.”

25. “But” should be inserted at the beginning of this verse.—This verse recalls the resolutions of xv. 22 sqq., in order to show how strictly they were adhered to, both by Paul and also by the Jewish Christians. (See note on xv. 1 sqq.)

26. This verse should read, “Then Paul on the next day took the men, sanctified himself with them, and went into the temple and announced the completion of the days of sanctification, until

the offering was offered for every one of them.”—“Sanctified himself :” i.e. imposed upon himself the abstinence required by the vow.—“Announced :” i.e. to the priests who had to declare the redemption of the vow.—“The completion of the days :” i.e. the approaching completion of the seven days of abstinence, after which only an offering was still required (comp. ver. 27).

**27.** *The seven days*: It appears that, according to the writer's view, out of the thirty days' naziriteship of the men spoken of in ver. 24, seven days still remained, which Paul undertook with them, and that, in consideration of his paying the charges, this shorter period was reckoned to him as the full time. According to xxiv. 11 (comp. also xxi. 16, 18, 26, xxii. 30, xxiii. 11, 12, 31, xxiv. 1), these seven days could not yet have elapsed.

**29.** *Trophimus*: see xx. 4.—It is by no means clear how this mistake of the Jews is to be explained. Moreover, the charge of having profaned the temple is only repeated once (xxiv. 6), Paul never defends himself against it, and it plays no part at all in the trial. Perhaps it is only an allegorical expression of the general reproach of surrendering the sanctuary to the Gentiles, which was made against him by Jews and Jewish Christians alike.

**31.** *Came*: strictly “came up,” i.e. into the fortress Antonia near the temple.—[*Chief captain*: properly “tribune” here and throughout the book.—*Band*: properly “cohort.”]

**33.** *Took him* should be “seized him.”

**34.** *Castle* should be “barracks,” i.e. the barracks in the fortress. [So also in ver. 37 and throughout the book.]

**37.** *He said* should be “he saith.”

**38.** *Art not thou* should be “art thou then not.”—*That Egyptian*: “the Egyptian.” This Egyptian had undertaken as a divine prophet to wage war from the wilderness against the Romans, in the reign of Nero. He had been defeated by the governor Felix and had fled. The officer's confusion of Paul with him is very remarkable. The writer appears to have accepted the remark purposely, in order, by setting forth the contrary, to make the innocuousness of Paul's gospel in regard to the state perfectly clear.

**40.** *In the Hebrew tongue*: Paul is here made as Jewish as possible, and here he does not, as we might expect from ver. 39, appeal to his Roman citizenship.

## CHAPTER xxii.

1. The apostle's defence, which follows here, has a distinct uniformity, and is complete in itself, in spite of the interruption after ver. 21. Its purpose is to prove the apostle's zeal for Judaism and the law, and to explain his calling to be an apostle to the Gentiles, equally with his removal from Jerusalem, solely on the ground of the express and repeated command of God in opposition to the apostle's own will. The circumstance also that the speech is addressed to "fathers," i.e. to members of the high council, which one would not expect in the midst of a tumultuous mob, corresponds with this fact of the speech being directed against the prejudices of Judaism.

3. *Perfect manner* should be "strictness."—*Zealous*: i.e. against the gospel.

9. The very reverse of ix. 7.

12 sqq. In accordance with the purpose of the speech, the calling of the apostle to the mission to the Gentiles is here put simply in the mouth of a faithful adherent of the law, whereas in ix. 15 Christ himself expresses this demand to Ananias [and in xxvi. 16 sqq. directly to Paul himself].

13. *Stood* should be "approached."—*I looked up upon him* should be "I received my sight and looked upon him."

17 sqq. In ix. 26 sqq. there is not a word about this vision in the temple upon which here so much stress falls as a new and express command of God.

19. An objection raised by the apostle intended by the writer to show his love for the Israelites.

24. [*Chief captain*: see note on xxi. 31.—*Castle*: see note on xxi. 34.]—It is not till the decisive moment, in extreme necessity, that Paul brings forward his Roman citizenship, then to receive the more brilliant satisfaction from the Roman official.

25. *And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said*, should be "And when they had stretched him out for scourging, he said." The officer threatens torture because he has not understood the speech delivered in Hebrew.

26. *Take heed what thou doest*: "What art thou about to do?"

28. The remark of the officer that he had purchased his Roman citizenship, throws into bolder relief Paul's declaration that he is a Roman citizen by birth.

**29.** This fear on the part of the officer is probably only mentioned in order to lay the greater weight upon Paul's Roman citizenship. Otherwise, seeing that he was ignorant of it, such fear would be quite unintelligible. He does not actually release the apostle from his fetters until the next day, and indeed after the examination Paul always appears to be in bonds (see xxviii. 18 and many other passages, especially xxvi. 29 and xxviii. 20).

### CHAPTER xxiii.

**1.** Paul, conscious of his innocence in regard to the demands of Judaism, assumes a specially bold attitude.—*In all good conscience*: It appears from what follows, and from all the apostle's speeches in his own defence, that this expression is not, as might be supposed, to be referred only to the period since his conversion; it is equally valid of his relation to Judaism (see especially xxiv. 14 sqq., xxvi. 22). Of course this cannot be reconciled with the consciousness of not having fulfilled the law which is expressed in Gal. ii. 15 sqq., Rom. vii. 14 sqq.

**5.** This withdrawal of a just reproof, and humility before the Jewish high-priest, is intended by the writer to show Paul's submission to the law. In itself, the ignorance of his being the high-priest is as improbable as Paul's humble submission to the authority of the law is incredible.

**6.** *When* should be “since.”—The Book of Acts actually does reduce the difference of doctrine between Paul's gospel and Judaism to the question of belief in the personal resurrection of Jesus (xxii. 3 sqq., xxiv. 14 sq., xxv. 19, and elsewhere frequently). As a matter of fact, however, this distinction goes far deeper and includes far more. It would have been impossible for the historical Paul, when a Christian, still to call himself a Pharisee, and equally impossible for the Pharisees to take his part (as they do here in ver. 9). They are to a certain extent Christianized here, as Gamaliel is in v. 33 sqq.

**9.** *Let us not fight against God* should be omitted.

**11.** This verse introduces the journey to Rome to which everything that follows relates.

**12.** *Certain of the Jews banded together and bound themselves under a curse*, should be “the Jews united and cursed themselves.”—*The Jews*: i.e. the people as a whole. There is no

reference whatever here and in 14 sq. to the Pharisees taking Paul's part.

**14.** *Eat nothing* should be “taste nothing.”

**15.** *To-morrow* should be omitted.

**17.** Here and in all that follows we should again specially notice the willing assistance and consideration of the Roman officials, who deliver Paul and protect him, taking the most comprehensive measures for this purpose.

**20.** *As though they would inquire somewhat of him more perfectly*, should be “as though they would learn something more exact concerning him.”

**21.** *A promise from thee* should be “a promise given by thee.”

**24.** *And provide them beasts* should be “and let them provide beasts of burden.”

**26.** *Felie*: Antonius Felix was a freedman of the emperor Claudius and brother of Pallas, the well-known powerful favourite of Claudius and Nero. In the year 53 A.D. he had been made procurator of the province to which Judea belonged. The writer of the Book of Acts maintains a significant silence concerning the absolute incapacity of Felix to deal with the difficult question that had come before him, his unrestrained and capricious despotism, his cruelty and his servile disposition.

**27.** *Should have been killed* should be “was on the point of being killed.”—*An army*: “the soldiers.”—The letter only brings forward the points with which the writer of the book is concerned; viz. the deliverance of Paul from the hands of the Jews and the protection of his rights as a citizen.

**30.** *Laid wait for* should be “had on foot a plot against.”—*Farewell* should be omitted.

**31.** *Antipatris*: in the plain on the high road between Cæsarea and Jerusalem.—*By night*: probably only the time of their decampment, and not of the arrival in Antipatris.

**35.** The respectful conduct of the Romans is shown by Paul's being taken, not to prison, but to the government head-quarters.—[*Judgment hall*: strictly “Prætorium.”]

#### CHAPTER xxiv.

**1.** *Who informed* should be “and they informed.”

**2.** *Quietness*: i. e. peace from the bands of robbers which

infested the land, the contest with whom was the chief task of every governor of Palestine in those days.—*Very worthy deeds are done unto this nation*, should be “this nation enjoys good institutions.”

3. *We accept it* should be “we acknowledge it.”—*Always*: “in all ways.”

6—8. These verses should read, “And he hath also attempted to profane the temple, from whom, if thou wilt inquire into it, thou canst receive information concerning all that of which we accuse him.” The rest should be omitted. [There is no MS. authority for omitting the words *whom we took*.]

[9. *Assented*: the best MSS. have “joined in attacking him.”]

10. *Of many years*: viz. since A.D. 53, i.e. for six years.—*The more cheerfully*: “fearlessly.”

11. See note on xxi. 27.—*For to worship*: comp. xx. 16, where the same motive for the journey from the Jewish law appears.

14. See note on xxiii. 6 sqq.

16. *And herein do I*, should be “wherefore I also.”

17. *Many* should be “several.”—Even the well-known great collection for the Christian community at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1 sqq.) appears here as a proof of Paul’s adherence to the people of Israel.

18. *Whereupon* should be “in the midst of which.”—*Certain Jews from Asia*: The originators of the charge and witnesses of the offence Paul had committed are represented as absent.

22. *That way* [strictly “the way”]: i.e. the way of salvation (see ix. 2, xvi. 17, xviii. 25 sq.).—The answer given by Felix is an excuse, the real reason for delaying his decision being, according to our author, the deeper knowledge of Christianity which he is here said to have possessed and his relation to Judaism. That Felix actually had any such deeper knowledge is in itself extremely unlikely. It is probably only intended, in accordance with the ideas of the writer, to show again the juster judgment of Christianity on the part of the Roman civil power. The same thing is also said of Festus, xxv. 10.

23. *Liberty* should be “indulgence.”—*Or come* should be omitted.

24. *Drusilla*: the daughter of Herod Agrippa I. (see note on xii. 1) and former wife of a prince of Emesa, from whom Felix

whose third wife she now was, had enticed her away with the help of a Jew named Simon (see note on viii. 9 sqq.). The fact that she was a Jewess seems to be purposely emphasized here.

**25** sq. This picture of the deep impression made upon Felix by the apostle's preaching is irreconcilable alike with the well-known character of Felix, and with the mercenary intention and lust for popular favour which follow. These motives lead him, in spite of his own better knowledge (ver. 22), to detain Paul unjustly; while in the first place he had no longer any need of popular favour, and in the second place he could only have obtained it by delivering Paul up to the high council. The writer, hastening rapidly over this period of two years, desires on the one hand to establish Felix's favourable judgment of Paul, and on the other hand to explain his detention of him, but he does not succeed in reconciling these two things.

**27.** This change took place in the year 60 or 61. It is probable that Paul's Epistle to Philemon dates from the period of this two years' imprisonment in Cæsarea.

#### CHAPTER XXV.

In this chapter are repeated before Festus in a short account the same accusations and the same defence that we have already had before Felix, except that Paul's having to defend himself against the charge of having offended against the emperor (ver. 8) is new, and is scarcely consistent with ver. 18. More important, however, is the apostle's appeal to the emperor (vv. 10—12), which is necessitated by the partiality of Festus (vv. 9, 10), whereas in xxviii. 19 only the hostility of the Jews is represented as the ground of his appeal. The writer seems here to wish to explain the necessity for Paul's appeal by the conduct of Festus, although the course attributed to Festus elsewhere is much more probable considering his caution and justice, and is hardly to be reconciled with this partiality (comp. vv. 4, 12, 16, 20, 25 sq.).

**2.** *High-priest*: “high-priests.”

**3.** *Desired favour* should be “begged a favour.”—*Laying wait in the way to kill him* should be “plotting to kill him by the way.”

**5.** *Able* should be “in power.”

**6.** *More than ten days* should be “not more than eight or ten days.”

7. *Against Paul* should be omitted.  
 9. *Willing to do the Jews a pleasure* should be “desiring to earn the gratitude of the Jews.”  
 12. *The council*: i.e. his own council, not here the high council of the Jews.  
 13. *Agrippa*: i.e. Herod Agrippa II., son of Agrippa I. The emperor Claudius gave him first the kingdom of Chalcis and afterwards the tetrarchies formerly held by Philip and Lysanias, with the title of king and the supervision of the temple.—*Bernice*, of deserved notoriety, sister of Agrippa II. and Drusilla. She was afterwards the mistress of Vespasian and Titus.—The appearance of the Jewish royal pair in connection with the rest of the description serves finally to establish the apostle’s innocence of all the charges laid against him by the Jews. Hence the decision is left entirely to Agrippa (vv. 18 sq.), while Festus cannot even enter any distinct charge against the apostle in the letter to the emperor (ver. 26), though such complaints as he might have sent must have been before him, whether he regarded them as true or false, and indeed he knew well enough what they were (ver. 8).  
 14. *Many days* should be “several days.”  
 16. *To die* should be omitted.  
 18. This verse should read, “Then accusers came round him and made no accusations of the kind that I expected.”  
 19. *Superstition* should be “religion.”  
 20. *And because I doubted of such manner of questions*, should be “But as I was in a difficulty as to the investigation of these things.”  
 27. *Crimes* should be “accusations.”

#### CHAPTER xxvi.

2. The defence which here follows is intended to prove the Jewish orthodoxy of the apostle from his past life, and hence is addressed expressly to the Israelite Agrippa as a competent witness and judge (vv. 2 sqq. 19, 26 sqq.).  
 4. *At Jerusalem* should be “and at Jerusalem.”  
 6 sq. On this identification of the Pauline gospel with strict Mosaism, see note on xxiii. 6 sqq.  
 7. *King Agrippa* should be omitted. [The best MSS. have “O king.”]

8. This question, together with the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, is intended to establish the belief in the fulfilment of the promise of the Old Testament (vv. 6, 7).

9. *I verily thought with myself* should be “And so I thought indeed.”

15. *And he said* should be “But the Lord said.”

16 sq. What Jesus here says is addressed to Ananias in ix. 17, and spoken by Ananias in xxii. 13 sqq. The explanation of this seems to be that in the present speech it is not so much Paul’s authority as an apostle to the Gentiles as his Jewish orthodoxy generally which is to be established.

17. *Delivering* should be “separating.”

18. *And to turn them : “that they may turn.”*

20. Here (as in ix. 28 sq.) it is asserted that the apostle’s mission to the Gentiles was preceded by labours of his own among the Jews, and, as everywhere else in the Book of Acts, his labours among Gentiles and Jews are placed upon the same footing. Both these statements are unhistorical (comp. Gal. i. 22 for the first, and the various passages quoted in the note on xiii. 46 for the second), but they are both easily explained by the purpose of the speech and the book.

22, 23. Here also every distinction between the gospel of Paul and orthodox Mosaism which goes further than the mere question of the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, is completely abolished, just as in vv. 6 sqq., 20 (repentance and works), xxiii. 6, &c.

24. The impression made upon the Gentile Festus by the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, corresponds with the impression which (according to xvii. 32) this same doctrine had made at Athens. The writer is only concerned with the competent judgment of the Jew Agrippa (ver. 28), whose reply therefore is not to be understood as ironical, but as quite serious.

28. *Almost thou persuadest me* should be “with little thou persuadest me.”

29. *I would to God, &c.*, should be “I would to God, with little or much, that not only thou, but also all those that hear me this day, were such as I am,” &c.

31, 32. In this private, but all the more significant, acknowledgment, we find the goal of the whole section (xxv. 13—xxvi.

32), viz. the unequivocal absolution of the apostle from all guilt, not only by the Gentiles, but also, above all, by the Jewish authorities.

#### xxvii. xxviii.

The apostle's journey to Rome and his labours there.

#### CHAPTER xxvii.

**1.** According to ix. 15, xix. 21, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 24, our author had the journey to Rome in view from first to last as the end of the apostle's labours. Hence, at this important point of his narrative, he again proceeds to quote the words of the journal before him. The want of connection between this first verse and what immediately precedes, indicates plainly the return of the writer to the narrative of his authority. Hence we may at any rate regard this section as in the main the well-authenticated narrative of an eye-witness (as to the person of the original narrator, see pp. 264 sq.). And yet there are some portions of this narrative which have been inserted by the writer of the Book of Acts in order to bring it into harmony with his own fundamental opinions and the object of the whole book (for example, more particularly, xxvii. 21—26, 33—36, xxviii. 17—31).—*Augustus' band*: perhaps the five cohorts in Cæsarea, serving as an imperial body-guard.

**2.** *Adramyttium*: a city on the coast of Mysia.—According to xx. 4, Aristarchus had been a companion of Paul's travels from the time of his leaving Macedonia, so that there must have been some mention of his departure from him meanwhile in the portion of the journal which is omitted (comp. also xix. 29).

**3.** The remark about Julius here made is in keeping with the general tone of the Book of Acts and serves the purpose of the writer.—*To refresh himself* should be “to enjoy their attention.”

**4.** *Cyprus* lies to the west of their course, and its lofty coast protects their vessel from the wind.

**7.** *Cnidus*: a sea-port of Caria at the point of a peninsula which projects into the sea between the islands of Cos and Rhodes. *Salmone*: on the east coast of Crete.

**8.** *Hardly passing it* should be “passing it with difficulty.”—*The fair havens* should be “Fairhavens,” on the south coast of Crete.—*Lasea*: unknown.

9. *The fast*: i.e. the fast of the great day of reconciliation which fell at the time of the autumnal equinox.

12. *The more part advised*, &c., should be “The majority resolved to sail away for Phœnix, a harbour of Crete, lying towards the south-west and north-west, and winter there.” Phœnix was on the south coast of Crete.

13. *Loosing thence, they sailed close by Crete*, should be “They weighed anchor and approached nearer to Crete.”

14. *Against it*: “contrary to their purpose.”

16. *Clunda*: south-west of Crete.—*We had much work to come by the boat* should be “We could scarcely secure the boat” (i.e. the small boat belonging to the ship for use in case of distress).

17. *Lest they should fall into the quicksands* should be “lest they should be cast upon Syrtis,” i.e. the great sand-banks on the north coast of Africa to which this name was given.—*Strake sail* should be “let down the tackle,” i.e. probably the rigging.

18. *Lightened the ship* should be “cast the freight overboard.”

21. The section which here follows, as far as ver. 26 (and probably also the section vv. 33—36), betrays itself as an insertion of the writer into the narrative of the journal. Each passage may be removed from the narrative without any break of the context. The introduction of celestial appearances in moments of extreme danger and on occasion of decisive crises is a general characteristic of our author (xvi. 9, xviii. 9, and especially xxiii. 11), and Paul’s confidence here can scarcely be reconciled with ver. 10. Moreover, the expression of the thought that the crew had all been preserved for Paul’s sake, is scarcely credible in the mouth of the historical Paul, for it would assume an unnaturally exalted self-consciousness. Finally, ver. 34 has a striking resemblance to Luke xxi. 18.

23. *The angel of God whose I am* should be “an angel of the God whose I am.”

27. *In Adria* should be “on the Adriatic Sea.”

34. *For this is for your health* should be “for this serves for your safety”

38. *The wheat* should be “the provisions.”

39. *They discovered a certain creek with a shore* should be “they noticed a bay with a level beach.”—This description of the

locality corresponds very well with the Cala di San Paolo in Malta, which has its name from this event.

**40.** This verse should read, “And having cut away the anchors, they let them go into the sea, and at the same time they loosed the bands of the rudder and hoisted the top-sail before the wind, and made for the beach.”

**41.** *And falling into a place where two seas met*, should be “and having come upon a tongue of land.”

[**43.** *Willing to save*, i.e. “desiring to save.”]

#### CHAPTER xxviii.

**1.** *And when they were escaped then they knew*, should be “And when we were saved we learned.”—It is remarkable that in contrast to the exact and detailed description of the voyage we have so short and fragmentary an account of the three months’ stay in Malta. The writer cannot in any case have given us the complete narrative here, and he appears also to have altered it in other ways.—*Melita* or Malta lies south of Sicily. The inhabitants are spoken of as “foreigners” because of their Carthaginian descent.

**2, 4.** *Barbarous people, barbarians*, should be “foreigners.”

**3** sqq. The description which here follows is so simple and vivid that it can hardly be legendary, but probably actually stood in the original journal. The original writer, however, does not in the least require us to regard the occurrence as a miracle. The reason which led the writer of the Book of Acts to preserve it is easy to recognize (comp. xiv. 11 sqq.).

**7.** *The chief man*: this seems to mean a Roman official.

**11.** *Castor and Pollux*: strictly “the Dioscuri,” i.e. Castor and Pollux, the patron deities of sailors. Such individual details clearly mark the description of an eye-witness.

**12.** *Syracuse*: on the east coast of Sicily.

**13.** *And from thence we fetched a compass*, should be “And after we had sailed round,” i.e., probably, sailed round Sicily.—*Rhegium*: at the southern point of Italy on the straits of Sicily.—*Puteoli*: an important harbour near Naples.

**14.** This verse should read, “Where we found brethren and were comforted in them, remaining seven days, and so we came to Rome.”

**15.** *The brethren*: i.e. the Christians in Rome.—*Appii Forum*: on the Appian Way, about forty miles from Rome.—*The three taverns* Trestabernæ (i.e. Three Taverns), nearly ten miles from Appii Forum on the way to Rome, at the extremity of the Pontine marshes.

**16.** From verse 20 we may reasonably suppose that this soldier was chained to Paul.

**17.** *Customs* should be “laws.”—In Rome also, and indeed in Rome more than anywhere else, the Paul of the Book of Acts must testify to his Jewish orthodoxy and his innocence. Even here he must earn his right to labour among the Gentiles by first turning to the Jews and experiencing and plainly establishing their unwillingness to receive the gospel (comp. xiii. 46 sqq., xviii. 6 sq., xix. 9, &c.).—In this defence of the apostle, the writer lays the blame of his imprisonment so entirely upon the Jews, that he actually affirms that it was the Jews who compelled him to appeal to the emperor, while, according to his own earlier account, it was the governor Festus (see xxv. 9 sq.).—Here, as we have already seen in xxiii. 6, xxiv. 14 sqq., xxvi. 6 sqq., every real distinction between Paul’s gospel and Mosaism is denied (comp. latter half of ver. 20).—*Delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans*: incorrect according to xxi. 33 sqq.

**21.** This statement that the Jews did not know anything about Paul or his trial, is scarcely credible when we consider his twenty years’ labours and his two years’ imprisonment in Cæsarea; and the writer seems only to have introduced it here in order to afford a motive for Paul’s discourse before the Jews, and his clear explanation to them in the imperial city at the very goal of his labours.

**24** sqq. Here once more Paul’s experience is set forth most plainly and emphatically as the final issue of the whole book. All along the writer has laid the greatest possible stress upon it, and thus in ver. 28 we see the goal and destination of the book itself.

**25.** *After that Paul, &c.*, should be “Because Paul had pronounced one single judgment, namely, that the holy spirit spoke rightly through the prophet Isaiah,” &c.

[**29.** This verse is not in the oldest MSS.]

**30, 31.** In these two verses the chief stress lies upon the long freedom in the proclamation of the gospel to all the world which the apostle as a prisoner enjoys in Rome at the hands of the Roman civil power, as he had done in Cæsarea.—As a last memorial of the apostle's labours for the gospel, the Epistle to the Philippians has been preserved to us from this period. There is every probability that at the close of these two years, in the year 64 A.D., he fell a victim to the Neronian persecution. It would have been impossible, however, for our author more distinctly to undermine the whole purpose of his book (*viz.* to demonstrate the obstinacy of the Israelites and the receptivity of the Gentiles, and the satisfactory relation in which the gospel and the apostle stood to the Roman civil power), than by giving an account of the terrible Neronian persecution, and the martyr's death which Paul suffered. Hence he leaves us in uncertainty as to the result of Paul's trial, in regard to which he has so long kept us in suspense (see note on xii. 17).



## WILLIAMS AND NORGATE'S PUBLICATIONS.

---

Baur (F. C.) Church History of the First Three Centuries. Translated from the Third German Edition. Edited by the Rev. Allan Menzies. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

Baur (F. C.) Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Work, his Epistles and his Doctrine. A Contribution to the Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Edited by E. Zeller. Translated by Rev. Allan Menzies. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21s.

Bleek (F.) Lectures on the Apocalypse. Edited by T. Hossbach. Edited by the Rev. Dr. S. Davidson. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

Ewald (Professor H.) Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Translated by the Rev. J. Fred. Smith. 5 vols. 8vo, cloth. each 10s. 6d.

Ewald (Professor H.) Commentary on the Psalms. (Poetical Books of the Old Testament. Part I.) Translated by the Rev. E. Johnson, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. each 10s. 6d.

Hausrath. History of the New Testament Times. The Time of Jesus. By Dr. A. Hausrath, Professor of Theology, Heidelberg. Translated, with the Author's sanction, from the Second German Edition, by the Revds. C. T. Poynting and P. Quenzer. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21s.

Keim's History of Jesus of Nazara, considered in its connection with the National Life of Israel, and related in detail. Translated from the German by A. Ransom and the Rev. E. M. Geldart. In 6 vols. Vols. I. to V. 8vo, cloth. each 10s. 6d.

Kuenen (Dr. A.) The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State. By Dr. A. Kuenen, Professor of Theology at the University, Leyden. Translated from the Dutch by A. H. May. 3 vols. 8vo, cloth. 31s. 6d.

Pfleiderer (O.) Paulinism. An Essay towards the History of the Theology of Primitive Christianity. Translated by E. Peters, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21s.

Zeller (Dr. E.) The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles, critically investigated. Preceded by Dr. Fr. Overbeck's Introduction to the Acts of the Apostles from De Wette's Handbook. Translated by Joseph Dare. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 21s.

Protestant Commentary (A Short) on the New Testament, with Introductions. From the German of Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Lang, Pfleiderer, Lipsius, and others. Translated by the Rev. F. H. Jones, of Oldham. 2 vols. Vol. I. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

*Subscribers to the Theological Translation Fund Library receive all the above Eleven Works at the rate of 7s. per volume. Prospectus, with Contents of the Series, post-free on application.*

*WILLIAMS AND NORGATE'S PUBLICATIONS.*

THE HIBBERT LECTURES.

Kuenen (Professor A.) On National Religions and Universal Religions. Hibbert Lectures, 1882. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

Davids (T. W. Rhys) The Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by some Points in the History of Indian Buddhism. Hibbert Lectures, 1881. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

Renan (M. Ernest) On the Influence of the Institutions, Thought and Culture of Rome on Christianity, and the Development of the Catholic Church. Translated into English by the Rev. Charles Beard, of Liverpool. Hibbert Lectures, 1880. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

Renouf (P Le Page) Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt. Hibbert Lectures, 1879. 8vo, cloth. 10s. 6d.

---

Cobbe (Miss Frances Power) The Duties of Women. A Course of Lectures delivered in London and Clifton. By Frances Power Cobbe. Second Edition. 193 pp. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt edges. 5s.

Cobbe (Miss F. P.) The Hopes of the Human Race. Essays on the Life after Death, and the Evolution of Social Sentiment. Second English Edition. 221 pp. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

Cobbe (Miss F. P.) Alone to the Alone. A Collection of Prayers. Third English Edition, with additional Preface. 221 pp. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt edges. 5s.

Cobbe (Miss F. P.) Broken Lights. An Inquiry into the Present Condition and Future Prospects of Religious Faith. Third Edition. 242 pp. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

Cobbe (Miss F. P.) Essays. Darwinism in Morals, and (13) other Essays (Religion in Childhood, Unconscious Cerebration, Dreams, the Devil, Auricular Confession, &c. &c.). 400 pp. 8vo, cloth. (pub. at 10s.) 5s.

Gould (S. Baring) Lost and Hostile Gospels. An Account of the Toledoth Jesher, two Hebrew Gospels circulating in the Middle Ages, and extant Fragments of the Gospels of the First Three Centuries of Petrine and Pauline Origin. By the Rev. S. Baring Gould. Crown 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

Hanson (Sir Richard) The Apostle Paul and the Preaching of Christianity in the Primitive Church. By Sir Richard Davis Hanson, Chief Justice of South Australia, Author of "The Jesus of History," "Letters to and from Rome," &c. 8vo, cloth. (pub. at 12s.) 7s. 6d.

Horne (Rev. W.) Religious Life and Thought. Sermons by William Horne, M.A., Dundee, Examiner in Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews; Author of "Reason and Revelation." Crown 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

Samuelson (Jas.) Views of the Deity, Traditional and Scientific; a Contribution to the Study of Theological Science. By James Samuelson, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Founder and former Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Science. Crown 8vo, cloth. 4s. 6d.

Sharpe's New Testament. 14th Thousand. Translated from Griesbach's Text by S. Sharpe, Author of "The History of Egypt." Fcp. 8vo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

Smith (Rev. J. Fred.) Studies in Religion under German Masters. Essays on Herder, Goethe, Lessing, Franck and Lang. By the Rev. J. Fred. Smith. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5s.

Strauss (Dr. D. F.) New Life of Jesus, for the People. The Authorized English Edition. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth. 24s.

